The Office of this JOURNAL *and of the* WEEKLY REPORTER *is now at* 12, *Cook's-court, Carey-street, W.C.*

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL *is*— *Town*, 26*s.*; *Country* 28*s.*; *with the* WEEKLY REPORTER, 52*s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth*, 2*s.* 6*d.*; *half law calf*, 5*s.*

All Letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, JUNE 14, 1873.

IT SEEMS that the point which we last week raised, namely, that by the terms of the charter every member of the Incorporated Law Society, being an attorney, solicitor, or proctor practising in England is eligible as a member of the Council, and cannot be disqualified by any bye-law, is fully as serious as we suggested it might prove to be. The Council laid a case before Sir John Karslake and Mr. Davy, who concurred in advising that Mr. Carpenter's proposed bye-law would be *ultra vires*. But the objection goes much further, and in deference to it the Council have omitted the bye-laws which required that every candidate for the Council should have been in practice for not less than ten years; that the President and Vice-President should have had at least three years' experience on the Council; and that the Council should be composed as nearly as might be of one-fourth country and three-fourths town members. In all these cases it was suggested—and the suggestion was generally acquiesced in—that the proposed restrictions, though they could not be legally imposed, should be adopted as part of the unwritten constitution; and we think that the country members will have just cause for complaint if at least one-fourth of the Council be not elected from among their number.

An opinion was expressed at the meeting that the now admitted invalidity of the bye-law restricting candidates for the Council to members who had been in practice for ten years necessarily involved the illegality of the Council elected during its continuance. But this is clearly not the case. Every member of the Council was eligible, and was validly elected. No candidate of less than ten years' standing had ever been rejected on that ground, and although the Society may complain that its field of selection had been unnecessarily restricted, the evil ends there, and the restriction, even if illegal, does not invalidate the acts of the Council, or its right to be the governing body of the Society.

THE DECISION OF THE QUEEN'S BENCH in the case of *Re Clements*, sets at rest a question which recent events have invested with considerable importance—the right of the examiners to inquire into the moral as well as the intellectual qualifications of candidates for admission as attorneys. On principle the matter was tolerably clear before the decision. Stat. 6 & 7 Vict. c. 73, s. 15, empowers the Common Law Judges, before they issue a fiat for the admission of any person to be an attorney, to examine and inquire, by such ways and means as they shall think proper, touching the articles and service, and the fitness and capacity of such person to act as an attorney. There is nothing in the statute, or in the order appointing the examiners made by the Judges from time to time, which can be construed as limiting the "fitness," with reference to which the examiners are to inquire, to mere intellectual fitness, and there was certainly nothing in the practice prior to the passing of the statute which could lead to an inference that such limitation was intended. The Act—as Lord Langdale remarked in moving the second reading in the House of Lords—merely provided for the continuance of the real and efficient examination which had been instituted in 1836. At the time this examination was first established, and down to the passing of the 6 & 7 Vict. c. 73, the statutes 4 Hen. 4, c. 18, and 3 Jac. 1, c. 7, were unrepealed. By the former of these Acts it was provided that "All attorneys shall be examined by the justices, and by their discretion their names put on the roll, and they that be good and virtuous, *and of good fame*, shall be received and sworn well and truly to serve in their offices." By section 2 of the Act of Jac. 1, it is enacted that "None shall henceforth be admitted attorneys in any of the King's Courts of Record aforesaid but such as have . . . practised in soliciting of causes and have been proved by their dealings to be skilful *and of honest disposition*." It is clear that up to the passing of the Act of Vict. the Judges were, in theory at least, bound to inquire into the character as well as the attainments of candidates for admission as attorneys. It is somewhat singular that the Act of Vict., which repealed the ancient statutes, and extended the examination to the "articles and service," did not also provide expressly for an inquiry into the character of the candidate. Probably it was taken for granted that the terms "fitness and capacity," borrowed from the statute of 2 Geo. 2 c. 23, would include both moral and intellectual fitness. The emphatic declaration of Blackburn, J., in the recent case, that "both upon principle and authority the examiners are to inquire into the moral as well as intellectual fitness of those who were candidates to be allowed to practise as attorneys," will be welcomed by a profession keenly sensitive to the discredit involved in the admission to their ranks of unworthy members. No one can doubt that the examiners are prepared in every case which may hereafter arise to act with the same firmness and judgment as they showed in the matter to which the decision of the Queen's Bench related, and that decision, besides confirming the practice of a rigorous investigation of the antecedents of candidates, may have the effect of preventing persons whose characters will not bear investigation from presenting themselves for examination.

BY A MAJORITY of (including tellers) 432 to 209, the Incorporated Law Society have rejected Mr. Carpenter's amendment when submitted as a substantive resolution, and have refused to ostracise for a certain period the retiring members of Council. Such a result is a subject of congratulation, for it would have been a lamentable confession of weakness if the Society had deliberately affirmed its own incapacity to elect the ablest and most efficient candidates from among its members unless all competition by retiring members of the Council were absolutely forbidden. At the same time, we consider that the Society is greatly indebted to Mr. Lewis for bringing the subject forward, and are satisfied that the considerable support which his proposition received will have convinced the Council that there is in the Society a feeling that their proceedings have not been characterised by sufficient energy and thoroughness, and will stimulate them to greater exertions in the future.

The revision of the bye-laws was completed at the same meeting with but little discussion. The two bye-laws proposed by Mr. Finch's committee, and not accepted by the Council, failed to meet with general support, and were lost. The former of these, which proposed to give to country members a power of voting by voting papers, appeared, as originally suggested by Mr. C. Harrison, jun., to be of much value; but as soon as by Mr. Williams' amendment it was extended to all members of the Society, it became open to the objections which in a former article we pointed out, and could not be supported. The latter bye-law was moved by Mr. Lake, in the presumed interest of country solicitors; but every country member present repudiated it as unnecessary and worthless; and in the face of this expression of opinion Mr. Lake withdrew it.

We think that some such bye-laws are needed, if the Society is to extend its influence among the country solicitors; but, perhaps, for the present enough has been done, in securing that occasional general meetings shall take place in the provinces.

YESTERDAY (Friday) the Lords Justices reversed the decision of Vice-Chancellor Malins in *Dance* v. *Goldingham* (21 W. R. 572). The case is one of considerable importance to trustees selling property. An estate was put up for sale by trustees in 1872, under conditions which provided that the title to the several lots should commence with a deed of the 12th March, 1858, under which the premises became vested in the vendors as trustees for sale, and that no earlier or other title should be called for or required, except at the purchaser's expense in all things, and that all recitals and statements in abstracted instruments, and in the particulars of sale, should be accepted as conclusive evidence of the indentures recited, stated, or referred to. The property had been held by two successive tenants for life, from 1819 to 1872, under the trusts of a marriage settlement executed in 1819. The original settlement had been lost; but this circumstance was not mentioned in the conditions. The property having been sold, a bill was filed by one of the *cestuis que trustent* to stop the completion of the sale, on the ground that the special conditions were unnecessary, since the trustees could, by careful search, have discovered the settlement of 1819, and also that the conditions materially prejudiced the sale. The Vice-Chancellor thought that the conditions were improper; but he came to the conclusion that the purchaser could not be deprived of the benefit of his purchase, as he was in no way mixed up with the irregularity, and, moreover, the evidence did not show that the sale had been, in fact, depreciated. The Lords Justices, on the contrary, held that, the conditions being improper, the *cestuis que trustent* were entitled to have the completion of the sale prevented, and that the purchaser was only entitled to his remedy against the trustees. This appears to be in accordance with the principles laid down in former cases, such as *Rede* v. *Oakes* (13 W. R. 303, 4 De G. J. & S. 515), where Lord Justice Turner said:—"The true question on which the validity of such a sale must depend seems to me to be this: Was or was not the sale made under such circumstances and in such a manner as that the *cestuis que trustent* ought to be held bound by it? If it was, the title of the purchaser could not, I conceive, be impeached. If it was not, his title would, I apprehend, be liable to impeachment at the suit of the *cestuis que trustent*."

THE JUDGMENT recently delivered by the Lords Justices in the case of *Ex parte Ogle, In re Pilling* is noteworthy, as indicating the disinclination of the Court of Appeal to extend the doctrine of the personal liability of trustees for moneys paid by them *bonâ fide* under a misapprehension of the law. The facts of the case were that a trustee under a deed of assignment for the benefit of creditors, under section 192 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1861, paid to bankers, who held bills upon which the bankrupt and other persons were liable, a dividend upon the full amount of the bankers' original claim, notwithstanding that before the payment of the dividend the amount due on the bills to the bankers had been reduced by payments made by the other persons liable on the bills. Upon an application by creditors to surcharge the trustee with the amount of dividend overpaid, the Lords Justices, affirming the decision of the Judge of the County Court at Manchester, held that the trustee, having acted *bonâ fide*, although under a misapprehension of the law, could not be made personally responsible. James, L.J., distinguished the case of a trustee in bankruptcy from that of an ordinary trustee, on the ground that the former had *quasi* judicial duties to perform, and was in the position of a judge or arbitrator appointed by the parties. He designated the decisions in which the Court of Chancery has held trustees and executors liable for moneys paid by them under an honest misapprehension of the law "cases of great hardship," and declared that he was not prepared to extend the doctrine laid down in them. It is satisfactory to contrast this language with that of some other judges—for instance, with Lord Redesdale's remark in *Doyle* v. *Blake* (2 Sch. & Lef. 343) with reference to a trustee who, as he said, "no doubt meant to act fairly and honestly." "If," said his Lordship, "under the best advice he could procure he acts wrong it is his misfortune, but public policy requires that he should be the person to suffer."

WE RECENTLY DISCUSSED (*ante*, p. 399) the loophole which has been opened in the Bills of Sale Act (17 & 18 Vict. c. 36) by recent decisions. An ingenious attempt to make a further breach was defeated by the Lords Justices in the case of *Ex parte Mackay, In re Jeavons*, reported in last week's *Weekly Reporter* (p. 664). In that case the question was raised whether an unregistered agreement to execute a bill of sale of certain specific chattels constituted a valid equitable transfer of such chattels. The answer to this question, of course, depended upon the interpretation to be given to the definition of a bill of sale contained in the Act—"the expression, 'bill of sale,' shall include bills of sale, assignments, transfers, declarations of trust without transfer, and other assurances of personal chattels." It was contended that, although an agreement for a bill of sale of goods gives an equitable right to them, and may be said to operate as an equitable assurance of the goods, it was not an "assurance" within this definition; that the words, in fact, ought to be confined to an assurance of personal chattels at law. The Lords Justices, however, rejected this strict construction, holding that the case was plainly within the mischief intended to be remedied by the Act; and also that it was fairly within the words of the Act. The former conclusion is indisputable; the latter, perhaps, somewhat doubtful; yet it is not easy to see what meaning the words "other assurances of personal chattels" can have if they do not refer to cases of this kind.

THE CRITICISMS we ventured to offer (*ante*, p. 396) upon the decision of Lord Romilly in *Erskine* v. *Adeane* have been fully confirmed by the result of the appeal, in which judgment was given on Wednesday last. The Lords Justices emphatically declared that there was no implied warranty on the part of a landlord that the land he lets is clear of noxious trees or shrubs, and said that in the absence of any express warranty a tenant must take the land as he finds it.

THE JUDICATURE BILL IN THE COMMONS.

It is always rash to predict the course of events in the uncertain world of Parliament. But it does seem at last as if the Judicature Bill had passed all serious perils; and that nothing but either strange remissness on the part of the Government, or some of those accidents which no one could foresee, can prevent the measure from becoming law this session. Throughout the debate of Monday and Thursday nights it was quite apparent that the second reading of the Bill would not be seriously opposed. Mr. Charley's amendment in favour of retaining the jurisdiction of the House of Lords, though it received some support of the abstract, debating society kind, never had any seriousness or reality about it. The rock upon which the Bill was in danger of shipwreck was Mr. Gregory's motion to refer it to a Select Committee. There is not the least reason to suppose that either Mr. Gregory himself, or those who spoke in favour of his motion, had any desire to obstruct the passing of the measure. The arguments in favour of a Select Committee, looked at by themselves, were very strong, so much so that, had this been the be-

ginning of May instead of the middle of June, they might, perhaps, have prevailed. But they fell short of showing that a Select Committee was an absolute necessity, or that any of the defects pointed out could not be dealt with in Committee of the House. On the other hand it was tolerably clear that to refer the Bill to a Select Committee was to kill it for this year; and that such an opportunity of passing a great measure might not recur for years, if it ever came at all. It was material to remember, too, as was forcibly pointed out by the *Times* on Tuesday, that the whole of next session must intervene before the machinery of the Bill has to come into operation, so that an oversight this year is not absolutely irreparable. The withdrawal of the motion was, therefore, as desirable on public grounds as it was prudent in parliamentary tactics.

In one sense, therefore, the debate upon the various proposals made has resulted in very little. But the value of the debate has been very great. It has shown exactly the points upon which objection is taken to the bill as it stands: it has shown them to be far fewer in number than had generally been anticipated; and it has, moreover, shown them, with one exception, to which we shall shortly advert, to be matters of a kind which can well be dealt with by the whole House, and in a moderately short time. In fact, the House has had its work in committee mapped out for it in a most convenient way.

The controverted matters are shortly these:—The insufficiency in number of the Equity Judges as compared with the Common Law Judges; the constitution and organization of the Court of Appeal; Official Referees; District Registries; and, lastly, the schedule of Pleading and Procedure.

Upon the first of these points, the number of the Equity Judges and their distribution, Mr. Osborne Morgan delivered himself in a speech which embodied in their crudest form a variety of prejudices which we have already combatted in these columns; and he demanded, if we rightly understand him, the immediate appointment of Equity Judges in every Division. Other speakers, in much more temperate and much weightier language, expressed fear about the working of the Bill as it stands.

It is not easy to gather exactly from the language of the Attorney-General what the intention of the Government is upon this matter. But it appears to have been understood by everybody that the Government were favourable to the increase of the Chancery Bench, at least to the extent embodied in the Bill as it now stands, with Lord Cairns' amendment. And as to the presence of Equity Judges in the other Divisions of the High Court, it appears to be Lord Selborne's view, and that of the Government, that future vacancies in those Divisions may with advantage be filled from the Equity side of the Profession. As to the increase in the number of Chancery Judges, it will, we hope, for every reason be secured. As to the other point—the appointment of Equity men from time to time to the bench of all the Courts—it would not, we think, be desirable that any Government or Chancellor should give any positive pledge; for circumstances cannot be foreseen. But, inasmuch as for the future all Courts are to administer the same law, and all Courts are to try facts as far as possible in the same way, so that the Equity Bar will soon become familiar with the conduct of trials of fact, it is clear that there can be no monopoly in favour of the present Common Law Bar of any class of judicial appointments. And, moreover, it would, doubtless, be well that for a time preference should, *cæteris paribus*, be given to Equity men. So that, though no pledge could with propriety be given upon the point, we have no doubt that the course suggested will, in fact, be carried out.

The Court of Appeal is the point upon which by far the most serious discussion took place during the recent debate, and which will certainly give rise to most discussion in committee. The speeches of Mr. Henry Matthews, Mr. Amphlett, and Sir R. Baggallay, are extremely interesting with reference to this matter, and deserve most careful consideration.

But before discussing the points suggested by those speeches, it is well, first, to point out what, under the provisions of the Bill, the Court of Appeal would practically be. Nominally, it would consist of the Lord Chancellor, the two Lords Justices, three other Judges, who would necessarily be chosen from the Common Law Bench, of the Common Law Chiefs, the Master of the Rolls, the four paid Judges of the Privy Council, and possibly some of the Law Lords as extra Judges.

Now, it is plain that just at present we cannot depend upon any of the Law Lords as regular attendants. It is also clear that the Privy Council Judges will have quite enough to do in hearing Indian and Colonial appeals, and that they can give little, if any, time to English business. It is clear, too, that the Common Law Chiefs and the Master of the Rolls will ordinarily sit in their own Courts, not in the Court of Appeal. The Appeal Court, then, would, for ordinary purposes, consist of the Lord Chancellor, the Lords Justices, and three selected Common Law Judges. Now, if such a Court always sat together, and if there were full security that it would always be similarly constituted, probably there are few reasonable people, if any, who would not be perfectly contented with it.

But the Bill allows the Court of Appeal to sit in Divisions—three being a *quorum*. One possible consequence of this Mr. Matthews and Sir R. Baggallay pointed out with great force. It would be open to the Court to resolve itself practically into two Courts—one for Common Law appeals, and the other for Equity appeals—so as to perpetuate in the most objectionable of all forms the distinction which it is the main object of the Bill to sweep away. Mr. Amphlett pointed out another danger, that two Divisions of the Court of Appeal might have to decide the same question, and might arrive at different conclusions, both decisions being final and binding upon all other tribunals—a deadlock fearful to contemplate. These are unquestionable defects, requiring amendment; and to their amendment the attention of the House in Committee will have to be given. It ought surely to be enacted that the Court of Appeal shall, for ordinary purposes, be one and indivisible. If the whole appellate jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee should be transferred to the new Court, it would, no doubt, be well that a special Division should be told off to administer Hindoo and Mahommedan law, and that of any of our Colonies whose law, like that of Lower Canada for instance, is not English; but for English cases there should be one Court, not several. In other words, the whole Court, however composed on each occasion, should, as a rule, sit together. The difficulty of place pointed out by Sir R. Baggallay might, till the new Courts are built, be met by the Court sitting sometimes at Westminster, and sometimes at Lincoln's Inn. But there ought perhaps to be some exceptions to the rule requiring the whole Court to sit together. There are many appeals not really involving any question of law at all, but turning wholly upon facts. These and some other cases might, if any mode can be found of distinguishing them from cases turning upon questions of law, be safely entrusted to smaller bodies.

The other objection to the Court of Appeal as proposed is that sufficient provision is not made for maintaining the representation of Equity in the Court. In this we think there is some truth. The Attorney-General proposes to obviate the difficulty by extending the area of selection of Judges for the Appellate Court. We cannot judge of the wisdom of his plan till we see it in detail. But the great security against danger lies, we think, in a proper enlargement (as to its precise extent we are not inclined to dogmatise) of the number of the Chancery Judges. If they are very few in number, it may well happen that, should a Lord Justice be removed, there may not be an Equity Judge fit to take his place. With larger numbers this can hardly happen.

Serious objection is next taken to the wide powers

given of referring causes or questions arising in causes to official referees—that is to say, to official arbitrators other than the ordinary officers of the Courts. That such powers as it is intended to confer will be, on the whole, of enormous advantage to suitors is beyond doubt; but, the power given of referring compulsorily "any question or issue of fact, or any question of account, in any cause or matter requiring any prolonged examination of documents or accounts, or any scientific or local investigation which cannot, in the opinion of the Court or a Judge, conveniently be made before a jury, or conducted by the Court through its ordinary officers," appears to be too wide in its terms. And certainly the provisions as to the Court's control over the referees and as to appeal from their decisions, are not sufficiently clear and precise.

The establishment of district registries in various large provincial centres, such as already exist in Lancashire, is a subject on which conflicting opinions naturally prevail. The provision of the bill that, unless it be ordered to the contrary, every step in the cause down to entry for trial to be taken in the District Registry is, we think, wrong, especially when it is remembered that this is to apply to every kind of legal proceeding, Common Law and Chancery alike. What ought to be done if the provision is to be adopted at all, is to go through the matter in detail, and determine in which of the steps commonly taken the action of the Court is wholly or mainly ministerial, and let these be taken in the District Registry and reserve those in which judicial discretion is involved for the Court or a Judge. If this cannot well be done by the Bill, it would be better to let the distribution be made hereafter by Rule.

The last important subject handled in the debate on the second reading, and which will come before the committee, is the rules of pleading and procedure comprised in the schedule. This is a subject involving, no doubt, the consideration of many details, and we cannot examine it this week. But we strongly think that no objection to the vagueness of the rules in the schedule ought to be allowed to delay the passing of the Bill; for, make what provisions you may in the Act of Parliament, it is the rules to be framed under it, and the manner in which they are applied, that must really govern the character of the pleading and practice of the future.

DAMAGES AGAINST CARRIERS.

We lately examined in these columns (*ante*, p. 381) the difficult and controverted question involved in *Hadley* v. *Baxendale* (2 W. R. 302, 9 Ex. 341), and the recent case of *Horne* v. *Midland Railway Company* (21 W. R. 481, L. R. 8 C. P. 131). We propose now to make a short review of the authorities as to the measure of the damages recoverable against carriers, where no special notice or contract intervenes. The question may arise under four different states of circumstances—either the carrier has received the goods and has not delivered them, or he has made delay in delivery, or he has delivered the goods in a damaged state, or he has made default in receiving them to be carried.

It is under the first of these heads that the rule seems to have reached the most settled condition, both in the English and the American Courts. Where there has been an entire failure to deliver goods which have been received to be carried, there has been, in the first place, an entire failure of the consideration in respect of which the freight was agreed to be paid; the freight, therefore, if already paid, can be recovered back. But, besides this, the goods themselves are lost; the sender is therefore entitled to their value. But what is their value? *Primâ facie*, their value is what it was at the time of delivery to the carrier. But with respect to articles of commerce, which form the great bulk of consignments, a further consideration arises. The duty of the carrier was to transport them in safety to a particular place at a particular time. If he had performed his duty they would have been available to the sender at that place and time. By the carrier's default, therefore, the sender loses the advantage which he would have had if they had been so available. It is fair, therefore, that he should recover their value as it would have been at the place of destination. But in order to get the goods to that place freight must have been paid for their transport thither, and that freight will itself form part of their value at that place. In estimating their value, therefore, at that place, the freight must be deducted, or the seller will recover that which he has never lost. Unless, therefore, the freight has been paid in advance, the damage will be the value of the goods at the place of destination, after deducting the freight which must have been paid to get them there, but which by reason of this non-delivery has never become due, or has ceased to be due. This rule was explicitly stated in *Brandt* v. *Bowlby* (2 B. & Ad. at p. 939), by Parke, J., and again in *Rice* v. *Baxendale* (10 W. R. C. L. Dig. 16, 7 H. & N. 96), and it seems to have been conceded without argument in *Sanquer* v. *London and South Western Railway Company* (2 W. R. C. L. Dig. 148, 16 C. B. 163). It had been adopted at a still earlier date in America in *Watkins* v. *Laughton* (8 John. 213, 1811), and *Amory* v. *Macgregor* (15 John. 24, 1818), and was followed in *Arthur* v. *The Schooner Cassius* (2 Story 81, 1841), and *The Joshua Barker* (1 Abb. Adm. Rep. 215). It has been thought that a different rule was laid down by Lord Ellenborough in *Parker* v. *James* (4 Camp. 112), where the sender of goods, which were captured as prize through the negligence of the shipowner, recovered merely the value of the goods when *put on board*. But this is not so, for Lord Ellenborough expressly said: "I have no evidence before me that the goods were worth more," thus plainly intimating that evidence would have been admissible to show that the goods had increased in value. In *Wheelwright* v. *Beers* (2 Hall. 391, 1829), indeed, the sender whose goods were improperly sold at an intermediate port for a sum less than their cost price (which sum he had received) was only allowed by the Supreme Court at New York to recover the difference between the cost price and the amount realised by the sale; but from this judgment Berkeley, J.—the only judge who delivered any reasons—dissented, and the decision cannot, therefore, claim much authority. In England, at least, the rule is clearly established by uncontradicted authority.

To that rule, however, which supposes an ascertainable market value for the goods at the place of destination, an addition was made in the case of *O'Hanlan* v. *Great Western Railway Company* (13 W. R. 741, 6 B. & S. 484), which provides for circumstances where the goods are to be delivered at a place where there is no market for such goods—that is, no market in which the owner of the lost goods can provide himself with similar goods at a wholesale rate. "The natural and fair measure of damages is the value of the goods at the place and time at which they ought to have been delivered to the owner. Now, the value of the goods at the place of delivery must be the market price, if there is a market for such goods; if there is not, either from the smallness of the place or the scarceness of the particular goods, the value at the place and time of delivery would have to be ascertained as a fact by the jury, taking into consideration various matters, including, in addition to the cost price and expenses of transit, the reasonable profits of the importer, which are adjusted by what is called the higgling of the market . . . The jury must say what is the fair and reasonable profit which persons in the ordinary course of business would be likely to make" (per Blackburn, J., 6 B. & S. pp. 491-2, 13 W. R. 741).

But, in the absence of special contract, it is only damages capable of being measured by this general standard that can be recovered; not special damages arising from the peculiar arrangements or circumstances of the plaintiff. Thus, sub-sales effected by the sender

of the goods in reliance upon their due delivery, expenses incurred in awaiting their arrival, and special loss caused by reason of the plaintiff, through poverty, being unable to replace the missing goods, were disallowed by the Court in *Rice* v. *Baxendale* (*ubi sup.*).

The rule which governs the damages where the goods have not been delivered must also govern the case where the goods have been delivered, but in a damaged state. Here, however, as the goods actually come to the hands of the owner, it is only the difference in value that can be recovered; and the two items of comparison must be the value of the goods as it would have been at the place of destination if they had been delivered there sound, and their value as it was at the place and in the condition in which they were actually delivered. It is plain that the circumstances which determine the value of sound goods at the place of destination in cases under the first head will govern both terms of the comparison here; there may be a market for damaged goods as well as for sound ones; and again, it is quite possible that the only reasonable way of disposing of damaged goods may be to send them back to the place from which they came. In *Collard* v. *South Eastern Railway Company* (9 W. R. 697, 7 H. & N. 79), the damage to the goods was such that they could only be made saleable by the performance of an operation which caused delay; the damages allowed were the difference between their value at the time when they should have been delivered sound and their value after they had been so treated, which included, not only depreciation in intrinsic value, but fall of price during the delay. It is evident that this was the best means of arriving at what they were really worth in their damaged condition, and was the most favourable way of taking it for the defendants.

Under the head of delay, by analogy to the rule adopted in the case already mentioned, it follows that the damages must be the difference between the value at the place of destination of the goods at the time when they ought to have been delivered, and their value when they are delivered in fact. At first sight it may seem absurd to say that where goods are not delivered for, suppose, a year after the time when they ought to have been, the sender can recover only nominal damages, if the value of the goods and their price at the place of destination has not varied, although all the purposes for which the sender required them may have long since ceased. But in applying this rule, it must be remembered, on the one hand, that non-delivery within a reasonable time is good evidence of loss, and that, practically, therefore, the owner need never wait very long before bringing his action. On the other hand, it must be considered, that since, in this case as in the others, only general circumstances of damage can be taken into account, that loss which arises out of the special arrangements and circumstances of the plaintiff, and which is usually of far greater importance, must, in the absence of special contract, be discarded. Upon this last point we need only refer to the observations in these columns already referred to (*ante*, p. 381), and to the cases of *Wilson* v. *Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company* (9 W. R 635, 9 C. B. N. S. 632), *Great Western Railway Company* v. *Redmayne* (L. R. 1 C. P. 329), and *Woodger* v. *Great Western Railway Company* (15 W. R. 383, L. R. 2 C. P. 318). In the first of these cases (*Wilson's case*) the profits expected to arise from the manufacture of the goods into articles of dress the season for which expired during the delay, and travelling expenses uselessly incurred; in the second (*Redmayne's case*), the profits expected to arise in retailing the goods through the presence at the place of destination of the plaintiff's travellers, who were compelled to leave before the goods arrived; and in the third (*Woodger's case*), the expenses of the plaintiff's travellers detained in idleness through the non-arrival of the goods, were held not recoverable. It is doubtful whether *Black* v. *Baxendale* (1 Ex. 410) is consistent with those cases and the principles laid down in them, but from the peculiar circumstances of that case it cannot be relied on. The general rule above mentioned seems to be also adopted in America (*Kent* v. *Hudson River Railway Company* 22 Barber, 278).

In *Redmayne's case* the rule was laid down with sufficient clearness; only the difference between the respective values of the goods at the respective times above mentioned was allowed to be recovered, and it was said that "the market value of the goods was their value in the market, independently of any circumstances peculiar to the plaintiff." In *Wilson's case* a somewhat liberal construction was put upon this rule, which does not really vary it, but the limitation of which needs to be carefully observed. The plaintiff was allowed, in estimating the value of the goods at the respective periods, to take into account "the fluctuations of the season," by reason of which the goods were less available for profitable use at the time when they, in fact, arrived, than they would have been if they had arrived in due time. The circumstance relied on was that the caps into which the cloth was to be made were out of season when the goods arrived. The effect of this would be that possibly the cloth would be unsaleable then, or only saleable at a great loss; and that, perhaps, it could only meet a market by being sent back to the place whence it came. Looked at in this way, the evidence as to the season for the caps being over would be admissible, not as being itself evidence of loss, but as explaining why the cloth had fallen in value; and the case would be analogous to that of *O'Hanlan* v. *Great Western Railway Company*, mentioned above. The notion that the profits to be obtained by the manufacture of the caps could be recovered was distinctly repudiated.

(*To be continued.*)

REVIEWS.

Equity and the Judicature Bill. By ARTHUR WILSON, of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. (Reprinted, by permission, from the *Solicitors' Journal*). Henry S. King & Co. 1873.

This is a reprint in a neat and convenient form of the articles on Fusion which have recently appeared in this journal. It would not become us to say more with reference to the pamphlet than that the views it expresses have received the approval of distinguished members both of the Equity and Common Law Bench, and that "A Common Law Barrister," writing to the *Times* of Thursday, says:—"Mr. Arthur Wilson, in his excellent pamphlet, which every one interested in the Judicature Bill should read, suggests weighty reasons against any large or hasty increase in the number of the judicial staff. Whether Mr. Hemming or Mr. Wilson comes nearer the mark in his calculations is, comparatively speaking, unimportant. What is important is to remark that the stress laid on the necessity for more judges is the highest testimony to the merits of the Bill. A great measure must be singularly free from marked flaws when the most acute critics can find nothing for censure but a matter of administrative detail, which at bottom resolves itself into a question of pounds, shillings, and pence."

We are informed that Lord Westbury has appointed the 17th, 18th, and 19th inst. for a sitting in the European Arbitration, to dispose of some cases which are now ripe for hearing.

HARD WORDS.—In the debate on Thursday evening, Mr. Lopes gave a *resumé* of the epithets which had been applied to the legal members of the House of Lords. Mr. Osborne Morgan, he said, spoke of them as a kind of Greenwich pensioners. The Solicitor-General called them decrepid old octogenarians. The Attorney-General said they were an irresponsible body.

MEDICAL EVIDENCE.—Dr. Beard, in a paper read before the Medico-Legal Society of New York, said: "Out of the forty thousand physicians in this country, more or less, there are, perhaps, one or two hundred whose opinion in delicate and difficult psychological cases would be of value in a court of justice."

COURTS.

COMMON PLEAS.

(Before BOVILL, C.J., and KEATING, BRETT, and GROVE, JJ.)

June 6.—*In re an Attorney.*

In this case, which had been referred to the Master to report upon (*ante*, p. 535), notice had been given to the attorney that the case would be called on, but he did not appear.

Garth, Q.C., and *Murray*, appeared for the Incorporated Law Society. The report of the Master was read. He reported that the attorney was charged with misconduct in using the name of another attorney without his consent. The attorney brought an action against a police magistrate for some remarks made by the latter at the termination of a case in which the former was defendant. In this action he had used the name of Mr. G. After hearing evidence it appeared to the Master that the attorney had reasonable ground for suppcsing that Mr. G. had authorised the use of his name.

Garth, Q.C., said that certain circumstances had come out before the Master of which the Incorporated Law Society were unaware at the time when he moved for the rule, and the Master had very properly given the attorney the benefit of any doubt there might be upon the evidence.

BOVILL, C.J.—It is very clear upon the affidavits, and from the investigation that has taken place, that this was a matter requiring the interposition of those who watch over the interests of the profession and of the public, and it was quite right that the attorney should be called upon to explain that which was brought before the Court on affidavit when this rule was granted; but the Master has found that the attorney had reasonable grounds for believing that he had Mr. G.'s consent to his doing what he did, and does not find that the attorney has been guilty of misconduct as an attorney in reference to the matters by the rule referred to him. The Court do not think it necessary, therefore, to make any order upon the subject.

June 7.—*In re William Hunt.*

In this case a rule had been obtained last term by *Garth*, Q.C., on behalf of the Incorporated Law Society, calling upon the attorney to show cause why he should not be struck off the rolls (*ante*, p. 536). It was alleged that Mr. Hunt had been instructed by the executors of a Mrs. Bird to settle claims for calls on shares which the deceased held in two companies; that he arranged to settle these claims for £310, and that a cheque for that amount had been handed to him by the executors for the purpose of paying this sum, but that he had never paid over the amount to the liquidators of the companies.

Morgan Lloyd, Q.C., now showed cause.—He contended that before the sum could be paid over, certain formalities had to be observed, which necessarily caused delay. The cheque was drawn in the attorney's favour, and was handed to him at the end of July, 1872, and then before anything could be done the offices of the Court of Chancery were closed; and the money could not be handed over to the liquidator of either company until an order was obtained from the Court for that purpose, and that order was not obtained until after the long vacation. This gentleman was not really in default until after 31st March last, because the correspondence showed that up to that time there were disputes; and the authority from the liquidators to pay over the money was not posted to him till the 28th March last.

[BRETT, J.—In June, 1872, Mr. Hunt wrote to his client —"You must call on me between twelve and one and swear the necessary affidavits to-morrow, and bring a cheque for £320 to enable me to settle the matter." It is he, therefore, who asks for a cheque; and if the Court of Chancery is shut, and he cannot pay over the money, he ought not to ask for a cheque.]

He is prepared to pay the money at any time. At the time he wrote to his client in June, the offices were open, and also at the time the cheque was first received, but in consequence of some few days' delay it became too late. The learned counsel read several letters written by Mr. Hunt explanatory of the delay. He urged that, though Mr. Hunt was wrong in not paying the money, there was no intention to misappropriate it.

After hearing *Garth*, Q.C., and *Murray*,

BOVILL, C.J., said: A person in the position of an attorney of this Court, a member of an honourable profession, exercises great influence in country districts, and has the opportunity of doing great good or most serious mischief to the interests of society. It is necessary that this Court should see that persons who are upon the roll as officers of the Court, and accredited as attorneys of the Court, should be persons on whom reliance can be placed. The attorney in this case, in the month of July, 1872, received a sum of £310 from his client for a specific purpose. He induced his client to entrust him with that money for the purpose of paying it over, and from that time to the present he has not paid over one single shilling. He obtained the money under circumstances that lead to a strong suspicion, where no explanation is given, that he intended to appropriate it to his own purposes. Whether he originally intended to do so or not, as soon as the money was placed in his power he did appropriate it to his own purposes, and diverted it from the purposes for which it was placed in his hands. This application was made as far back as May 3rd last; but the matter was brought to the attention of the attorney some considerable time before; and neither in answer to the applications made against him, nor to the rule, has he made any satisfactory statement or affidavit, and the money remains unpaid to the present hour. I am of opinion that he is not a man who ought to be accredited to the public, and there being no explanation of his conduct, the sentence of the Court is that he be struck off the rolls.

The other Judges concurred.

PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATION.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

June 9th.—*Government of Ireland.*—Earl Russell brought in a bill providing for the appointment of a Secretary of State for Ireland in place of the Lord-Lieutenant, and also providing that, except in cases involving the punishment of death, the verdict of eight out of twelve jurymen should be sufficient for a conviction; and with regard to education, that the committee of the Privy Council in England should have the power to redress wrongs, and to restore to his post any manager of a school who might be unjustly removed.

Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendments Bill.—This Bill was read a second time, the Lord Chancellor stating that its object was to empower the Attorney-General to intervene in suits for nullity of marriage within six months from the pronouncing of a decree *nisi*, as he had power to do in matrimonial cases, in all instances where there was reason to suppose that the parties were in collusion to obtain a decree annulling the marriage.

June 10th.—*Agricultural Children Bill.*—Lord Henniker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said it provided that no child should be employed in agriculture under the age of eight; that up to the age of ten no child should be employed who could not produce a certificate of having attended a school 250 times during the previous year, and that up to the age of thirteen no child should be employed unless it could produce a certificate of 150 attendances in the previous year. After some debate, in which the principle of the measure met with general approval, it was read a second time.

The County Authorities Loans Bill was read a second time.

June 12.—The *Juries (Ireland) Bill* was read a second time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

June 6.—*Law Affecting Contracts of Masters and Servants.*—Mr. Vernon Harcourt called attention to the law affecting the contracts of masters and servants. He reviewed the circumstances connected with the conviction of the gas stokers, and said that the effect of Brett, J.'s, direction was that, in spite of the Act of 1871, an agreement among any set of men to induce a man in trade to alter his mode of business was an offence punishable by 12 months' imprisonment with hard labour. If men working for 10s. a week agreed to de-

mand 12s. they would be guilty of that offence. Was it not a great anomaly that by merely varying the form of the indictment a man should get eight times as severe a punishment as was inflicted upon another for the same offence? A poor man might break three contracts—one of service, and two of another kind. He might not be able to pay in all three cases, although in one only—viz., in respect of the contract for service—was he put in prison. If that was not class legislation he did not know what class legislation was.—Lord Elcho pointed out that Mr. Newton, who was secretary to the executive committee appointed by the various trades of the United Kingdom, in giving evidence before the committee of that House, said it would be necessary to protect both the masters and the men from open and wilful violation of contracts on the part of persons knowing that their acts would injure the employer, and, indirectly, their fellow-workmen, and that it would be necessary in certain cases to give power to punish the workmen criminally for neglect of duty.—Mr. Bernal Osborne and Mr. Auberon Herbert condemned the severity of Brett, J.'s, sentence on the gas stokers.—The Attorney-General, after stating that the conviction of the gas stokers and the judgment of Mr. Justice Brett did not turn on the Criminal Law Amendment Act at all, and the punishment would have been exactly the same if that Act had never been passed, said that the law of conspiracy was almost entirely a judge-made law, and it was natural, and perhaps inevitable, that it should not be merely elastic, which might be a good thing, but very vague and indefinite, which was a very bad thing. The propositions assumed by Brett, J.—first, that it was an offence against the common law of England for a number of persons to combine to compel a person to conduct his business in a way to overbear his will, and second that for a number of operatives to conspire or combine to break a civil contract was also an offence against the law of England—were new law, and it was for Parliament to consider whether the statement of the law of conspiracy had not gone beyond what was reasonable. In another case, almost contemporaneous, and like that of the gas stokers, Mr. Justice Lush had ruled that it was not a criminal offence for a man to refuse to work, or to dictate any terms as to his work, provided that those terms were not criminal, and that he did not use any means inconsistent with the 34 and 35 Victoria.—Dr. Ball always entertained the opinion that nothing could be more undesirable or unsafe than discussions in that House in reference to cases which had been decided in courts of law, and the conduct of Her Majesty's judges in trying them. He suggested that the control over prosecutions under the Master and Servant Act should be given to the Attorney-General.—The Solicitor-General dissented from the statement that Parliament had no right to examine propositions laid down by judges, insisting that, while comments on pending cases which might influence the decision were irregular, any one was entitled to criticize decisions actually given. He must say he dissented from the law as laid down by Mr. Justice Brett in the case of "*The Queen* v. *Bunn*." It was contrary to a charge given by Mr. Justice Lush, and he should not be guilty of disrespect to the former learned judge if he said he preferred the law as subsequently laid down by Mr. Justice Lush in a similar case, and not the less so because it was delivered with a full knowledge of the previous charge. Both charges could not be well founded.—Mr. James said that the gas stokers were punished because, admitting their right to combine, they had combined to break a contract, and because under sec. 14 of the Master and Servant Act this was a criminal offence. It would not have been criminal on the part of any other subject of the realm; but it was criminal in them. Was there not ground for complaint on this score?—Mr. Bruce was understood to say that the Government were fully satisfied that no necessity had been shown for altering the Act of 1871.

Law Agents (*Scotland*) *Bill*.—The House went into committee on this Bill, and the clauses were agreed to.

The *Conveyancing* (*Scotland*) *Bill* was read a third time and passed.

June 9th.—*Supreme Court of Judicature Bill*.—The Attorney-General, in moving the second reading of this Bill, described the main features of the measure, pointing out that the Bill was not one for the fusion of Law and Equity. Law and Equity would remain if the Bill passed, but they would be administered concurrently, and no one would be sent to get in one court the relief which another court had refused to give. Referring to the objections raised to the measure, on the ground that it would be injurious to Equity, he said that he would give very little support to a measure which would prevent the full operation and development of that admirable and beneficent system. He thought that in both the Equity and Common Law Courts there should be persons competent to give information on points respecting which the judges, having been brought up under a different system, were naturally wanting, and it was the intention of the Chancellor that everything necessary and proper for the administration of the law under the Bill should be done. But that was a very different thing from enacting that such a course should be pursued; because, to enact what Mr. Osborne Morgan's amendment pointed to, would be to stereotype on the face of an Act of Parliament that distinction between the administration of Law and Equity which it was the object of the Bill to destroy. Alluding to the anomalous state of the Courts of Appeal, he said that the Exchequer Chamber had almost every fault that a Court of Appeal could have, and he pointed out that practically, at present, the Common Law Appeals to the House of Lords were decided by a single judge, for there was not a single Common Law Lord but one who attended the sittings of the House. Besides, the House of Lords now was not what it used to be in former times. Formerly the judges were habitually summoned as advisers, and the House of Lords, in 99 cases out of 100, or even in a still larger proportion, followed the advice given by the judges. The House of Lords was at that time a convenient medium through which to ascertain the judgment of all the judges; but that was not the case now. The rule of the House of Lords now was that that the judges were not summoned unless both parties desired it. In conclusion, he described the constitution of the new Court of Appeal, and the provisions of the Bill relating to official and other referees.—Mr. Charley moved:—"That it is inexpedient to abolish the jurisdiction of the House of Lords as an English Court of Final Appeal." He cited the report of a select committee of the House of Lords which sat in 1856, also the report of a select committee which sat last year, in favour of the retention of the appellate jurisdiction. He thought that the fact that while, in 1870-71, there were no fewer than 128 appeals from one equity court to another, there were during the same period only 35 appeals to the House of Lords, furnished a conclusive answer to the argument that the abolition of the appellate jurisdiction of that House was a very pressing law reform, and he quoted from a speech of the present Lord Chancellor, in which he said that the administration of justice gains in dignity, independence, and stability from its association with the House of Lords.—Mr. Bourke, in seconding the amendment, complained that there was nothing to be found in the bill as to the position or qualifications of the referees. They might be barristers or attorneys, or gentlemen at large. The House ought to know who these referees were to be, and what salaries it was proposed to give them. He believed the House of Lords was the most popular court in the kingdom.—Mr. Osborne Morgan thought it was a strange thing that the constitutional objection to the removal of the appellate jurisdiction from the House of Lords had not occurred to the noble and learned lords who voted for the Bill, and it was a conclusive answer to that objection that the Bill had come from the other House. While anxious to promote the main object of the Bill, he wished to secure the appointment of Equity judges to the High Court of Justice. Perhaps the best course would be to transfer to each Common Law division one of the present Equity judges; but that could not be done without the sanction of the Equity judges. The alternative was the creation of new judges; and to that the real objection was the financial difficulty.—Mr. Gregory agreed with the main principles of the Bill—viz., the giving each court the full power of dealing with any case, and the rendering procedure uniform; but he regretted that the courts had not been broken up into more divisions, and a smaller number of judges allotted to each, and Equity and Common Law judges mixed together. As

to procedure, the effect of the Bill would be to perpetuate the practice which now prevailed at law of reserving questions of law for the full court, involving the expense and delay of two trials of one cause, and to extend it to the Court of Chancery. He hoped that the provisions of the Bill, giving to the judges power to refer cases to referees without the assent of the parties, would not be hastily adopted. The mode of procedure under the Bill demanded, he thought, considerable attention before the measure was passed into law. The traces of a Common Law hand were, in his opinion, too plainly written on the schedules of procedure—the tendency being to adopt the Common Law course instead of that which prevailed in the Court of Chancery, where the form of pleading gave the greatest satisfaction to the suitors and the practitioners, while nothing could be more unsatisfactory than the pleadings at Common Law.—Mr. H. James, while supporting the Bill, thought it had a tendency to go a little too far in the way of abolishing trial by jury, for under the 30th rule in the schedule it depended solely on the will of the judge whether he would remit a case to a jury or try it himself. Although, at first, he had thought the better course would be to refer this measure to a select committee, he had since altered that opinion. At this time of the year some legal members of the House would, perhaps, be unwilling to give up their time and relinquish professional engagements in order to sit on the committee; and even if they did, the Bill would be sent back to the House at a period when every member of the Common Law bar would be absent on circuit.—Mr. Matthews said the Bill involved questions of detail which could be much better discussed upstairs by a select committee than in this House. He looked upon the proposed system of official referees with the greatest dread and dislike. That system came in effect to this, that they were creating a subordinate order of judges, to be paid by salary, to be part of the patronage of the Lord Chancellor, whose number and qualifications were left absolutely open by the Bill, against whose decisions there was to be no appeal. The Bill would give the control of all the interlocutory steps up to notice of trial to fifty or sixty registrars, some of whom were not lawyers. This was as bad a scheme as could be devised, for it was localizing that which was best done in London by agents who conducted the business in the cheapest and promptest way, and the remission of nice questions of law to the registrars would lead to diversity of judgment and failure of justice. He thought the best plan would be to let the Bill lie fallow for the winter, so that the opinion of the profession might be collected. The solicitors, for instance, might throw more light on the measure than a Chancellor or ex-Chancellor could do.—The Solicitor-General said that the House of Lords was surely the best judge of its own dignity, and it had passed this Bill. People talked of the House of Lords as if it were a permanent legal tribunal; but the fact was that it was not a law tribunal at all, and it was a mere accident that it had a sufficient number of judges in it at the present moment. It was quite possible that some of the Law Lords might receive offers from insurance companies in course of liquidation to act as private arbitrators, and that they might think it consistent with their dignity to accept the office, and not to attend any more as judges in the High Court of Appeal. In his opinion that was not the proper appellate tribunal for a great country like this. His hon. and learned friend was entirely mistaken in what he had said about the official referee. The official referee was to make a report to the judge, who might act upon such report, or upon a part of it, as he thought fit. The judge might send back the matter to be inquired into by some other referee to report upon it. A special referee would only have the same powers as an official referee; in other words, his report would not be binding upon the judge. It was felt that a very large quantity of work might be done cheaply and quickly on the spot in the country, by persons who understood the subject, instead of having it inquired into in London at great expense and with great delay. As to referring the Bill to a select committee, there could be no doubt that if it were so referred the minority would not acquiesce in the opinion of the majority, and would fight over again in a committee of the whole House all the points on which they had been at issue. The debate was adjourned until Thursday.

Juries (Ireland) Bill was read a third time and passed.

Betting Houses.—Mr. Hughes brought in a Bill to amend the Act for the Suppression of Betting Houses.

Funds of Municipal Corporations, &c.—Mr. Winterbotham brought in a Bill to amend an Act of the 35th & 36th Vict. chapter 91, entitled, "An Act to authorise the application of Funds of Municipal Corporations and other governing bodies in certain cases.

June 10th.—*Law of Conspiracy.*—In answer to Mr Vernon Harcourt, Mr. Gladstone said that the Government would look with favour on any attempt which might be made by his hon. and learned friend to remedy the defects of the Law of Conspiracy, whether in the present or the next session of Parliament.

Rating (Liability and Value) Bill.—On the order of the day for going into committee upon this Bill, Mr. Scourfield moved that the order for the committee be discharged, and that the Bill be referred to a select committee. Mr. Gladstone said the Government intended to press forward both the Bills on this subject. They had, if not a vital, at all events a very close connexion, and the Government thought it would be quite possible to pass both measures in a satisfactory shape during the present session. The result of the motion—probably, indeed, its object—was to delay if not to defeat the Bill.—Many hon. members supported Mr. Scourfield's proposal, on the ground that the Bill was incomplete, and that a reference to a select committee was the proper means of supplying its deficiencies.—Sir J. Lubbock said there was one question involved in that Bill which had not yet received the attention it deserved—namely, the effect of the clause introducing the rating of timber. There could be no doubt that the effect of the Bill would be to encourage the removal of timber.—Mr. Stansfeld replied that, according to the law of Scotland, this kind of property was rated in that country, and he had yet to learn that hill-sides in Scotland were not so well clothed with wood as they were in England. He intimated that he was prepared to assent to assessment by arbitration. He had intentionally refrained from laying down principles to guide the assessment committees, and he pointed out that, although property of different kinds had been assessed, valued, and rated since the days of Elizabeth, there was not in the statute book of this country a single enactment defining the methods by which their value should be ascertained in England.—This was disputed by Mr. Hardy, who said that although he could not at the moment lay his hand upon the statute, he found in "Archbold's Poor Law" the principle laid down that property was to be rated at a sum equal to the rent at which it might reasonably be expected to be let from year to year, the rates and taxes to which it was subject being first deducted. On a division the amendment was rejected by 211 to 181.—In committee clause 1 was agreed to.

Innkeepers' Liability Bill.—The motion that this Bill be read a second time was rejected by 52 to 35.

June 11th.—*Factory Acts Amendment Bill.*—Mr. Mundella, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said that it proposed to shorten the hours of labour of women, young persons, and children from 60 hours a week to 54, to reduce "half time" to 33 hours a week, and to enact that the hours of labour shall be between 7 in the morning and 6 in the evening. It also raised the age of half-timers from 8 to 10, and the age of full-timers from 12 to 14; and it abolished the exemption enjoyed by the silk manufacturers.

Law of Conspiracy.—Mr. Vernon Harcourt brought in a Bill to amend the Law of Conspiracy as applied to masters and servants.

June 12.—*Supreme Court of Judicature Bill.*—The adjourned debate on the motion for the second reading of this Bill was resumed by Mr. Lopes, who contended that the concurrent administration of Law and Equity might be attained in the mode suggested by the Judicature Commissioners without reconstituting the Courts. He insisted that the abolition of the Appellate Jurisdiction of the House of Lords was unconstitutional, and strongly urged the Government to refer the Bill to a Select Committee.—Sir F. Goldsmid supported the Bill.—Sir R. Baggallay criticised the constitution of the proposed Court of Appeal, and urged that the appellate jurisdiction of the House of

Lords should be maintained. He thought that a reference of the Bill to a Select Committee need not involve delay.—Mr. West and Mr. Norwood supported the Bill.—Mr. Amphlett acknowledged that the Bill was in many respects an excellent one. He concurred in the proposal for the transfer of the jurisdiction of the House of Lords; but with regard to the proposed Court of Appeal he should have very much preferred a Final Court of Appeal of fewer numbers. What was to be done if the Divisions of the Appeal Court differed, and how was the law to be settled if they came to opposite conclusions? He advocated the reference of the Bill to a Select Committee.—Mr. Serjeant Simon and Mr. H. Palmer spoke in favour of the Bill.—Mr. Henley thought that an efficient Court of Appeal ought to be common to all the three kingdoms.—Mr. Holker approved most of the main objects of the Bill, but he doubted whether the provisions of the Bill would attain those objects. He contended that all distinctions between the courts should be abolished, and no Judge or division should be confined to one class of cases. He effectively exposed the absurdity of the motion that Common Law Judges could not master the principles of Equity. He was in favour of the retention of the jurisdiction of the House of Lords in certain cases.—Mr. Watkin Williams warmly supported the Bill.—Dr. Ball, while supporting the main principle of the Bill, thought that the details, and especially the new Rules of Procedure, furnished reasons for referring the Bill to a Select Committee. He strongly objected to the abolition of the judicial functions of the House of Lords, and contended that these functions were a duty, an obligation, and a sacred trust, which the House of Lords had no power to surrender or to relieve themselves of. He said that the Bench and the Bar in Ireland were unanimously in favour of having the same appellate tribunal for the two countries. He objected to the proposed Appeal Court as being too numerous.—The Attorney-General replied to Dr. Ball's arguments, and said that the question about the Vice-Chancellor was still under consideration, and might be dealt with in Committee.—Mr. Charley's amendment was negatived without a division, and the Bill was then read a second time.—Mr. Gregory withdrew his motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, and the committee was fixed for Monday week.

Bank of England Notes Bill.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer brought in a Bill to provide for authorizing in certain contingencies a temporary increase of the amount of Bank of England notes issued in exchange for securities.

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

The adjourned general meeting of the members of this society was held on Wednesday at the Law Institution, Chancery-lane, for the purpose, as was stated in the circular calling the meeting, of having Mr. Carpenter's amendment, which was carried by a small majority at the meeting of the 21st of May last, submitted as a substantive resolution.

The chair was occupied by Mr. Nelson, president of the society, who presided over a meeting which not only filled the body of the large hall, but also the galleries.

The CHAIRMAN, in opening the proceedings, stated that the first business of the day was to put Mr. Carpenter's amendment as a substantive motion.

A MEMBER inquired upon what principle it was purposed to put the amendment as suggested.

The CHAIRMAN replied, because it was not put as a substantive motion at the previous meeting, seeing that the meeting was adjourned almost immediately after the amendment was voted upon. Having read Mr. Carpenter's amendment,

Mr. C. E. LEWIS said he had had an important communication made to him by the Council, dated June 9th. The communication stated that a case had been laid before counsel, in consequence of a suggestion made since the last meeting, that Mr. Carpenter's amendment, if made the subject of a bye-law, would be *ultra vires*; but notwithstanding such opinion the Council were prepared to put Mr. Carpenter's amendment as a substantive motion *valeat quantum*. The opinion was as follows:—

"*Re Incorporated Law Society.*

The question is, no doubt, one of some nicety; but we think that a bye-law made in the terms of Mr. Carpenter's amendment (which would in effect exclude from the Council and render ineligible members who by the expresse words of the 8th section of the charter of 1845 are made eligible) would not be within the scope of the 12th section of that charter, and would be *ultra vires*.

It does not appear to us that the circumstance that the provision already made in the bye-laws that members of the Council going out of office by rotation shall immediately be eligible for re-election would in any degree affect the question.

(Signed) JOHN B. KARSLAKE.
HORACE DAVEY."

In order that the meeting might thoroughly understand the point involved, he would read the 8th article of the charter, and he understood the opinion to be based mainly upon the words, "There shall be a Council of the society, to be elected from among such of the members of the said society as shall be attorneys practising in England." In other words, the bye-law which was carried on the last occasion was supposed to be *ultra vires*, because it limited the choice of the members. He was much obliged to the Council for taking the hint which was given them by some friend of theirs, or some opponent of Mr. Carpenter's amendment, but he must draw the attention of the Council to the fact that during the whole of the last twenty-five years the Council had been elected under an illegal bye-law. He, also thought he was justified in saying that if the bye-law proposed by Mr. Carpenter was illegal, *a fortiori* was that proposed by the Council, because it was to the effect that no member of the society should be capable of being a member of the Council unless he should be at the time of election a practitioner of at least ten years' standing. He desired also to add that there were no less than two bye-laws which conflicted with the opinion of counsel.

The CHAIRMAN informed the meeting that when Mr. Lewis was communicated with he was distinctly informed that the Council proposed to put the amendment as a substantive motion *valeat quantum*.

Mr. RIPLEY having threatened with much vehemence to invoke the aid of the Court of Queen's Bench in the matter,

Mr. CARPENTER vainly endeavoured to persuade the meeting to listen to him, but could only obtain a hearing whilst he stated that he was of opinion there was no necessity to put his amendment as a substantive resolution at the present meeting; whereupon several members exclaimed that both he and Mr. Lewis had signed and issued a circular stating that the amendment was to be put as a substantive resolution, and that there were to be no speeches upon it.

Upon the motion of the CHAIRMAN, and in order to meet a difficulty in point of form which had been suggested by Mr. Lewis at the last meeting, a resolution was passed continuing the operation of the bye-laws now in existence until after the proposed bye-laws had been passed, and, if necessary, confirmed.

Mr. Carpenter's resolution was then put to the meeting, and upon a show of hands was declared to be negatived. Mr. Carpenter challenged the decision, whereupon the meeting divided, when the votes, excluding tellers, were declared to be—For the resolution, 207; against it, 430.

The announcement of the result of the division was made amid loud cheers; and this practically concluded the business of the meeting in which interest seemed to be taken, for a sudden exodus of many of the members at this stage occurred, only comparatively a few remaining.

The CHAIRMAN then stated that he held in his hand a protest, signed by two members of the society, objecting to the meeting as irregular, upon the ground that it was his (the Chairman's) duty, on the last occasion, to put the amendment as a substantive resolution. He differed from that opinion. At the same time, it must be obvious to them all that if it had been done it would have been necessary to call the present meeting to confirm it, and the result would have been the same. The consequence of the division which had just been taken would be that the 30th bye-law, as proposed by the Council, would be carried,

and they would now commence with bye-law No. 3, and proceed in regular order.

The bye-laws, as proposed and amended, were then considered, and passed with mere verbal alterations, until the 11th bye-law was reached, providing for a statement of assets and liabilities, as well as receipts and disbursements, being left in the secretary's office.

Mr. KIMBER proposed that a copy should be sent to each member.

Mr. ALLEN (Birmingham) suggested that the accounts should be published in the *Solicitors' Journal* and the *Law Times*.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that the object of Mr. Kimber's amendment was accomplished by the new bye-law 53A, which had been proposed by Mr. Finch's committee, and adopted by the Council.

After a short discussion the amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. BOLTON thought it would be well if a list of the attendances of members of Council was printed with the accounts, and circulated amongst the members; but the suggestion not having been seconded, no action was taken upon it.

The discussion upon the proposed bye-laws was continued, the alterations proposed being merely of a verbal character, until bye-law 24, which proposed to require that the president and vice-president should before election have had three years' experience on the Council, was reached. On the motion of the Chairman, this requirement was expunged, as of doubtful validity.

Upon bye-law 25 being put to the meeting, Mr. COVER suggested, that if Sir John Karslake's opinion were law, it was *ultra vires* to require that a certain proportion of the Council should consist of London and the remainder of country solicitors, inasmuch as such a requirement practically limited the class from which a portion of the Council was to be chosen.

The CHAIRMAN thought the objection well-founded, and was supported by Mr. WILLIAMS, who, however, maintained that it ought to be deemed part of the unwritten constitution, if not the actual law, of the society, that at least one-fourth of the Council should be elected from among the country members.

Mr. LAKE strongly urged this view, and protested against the omission of the clause, which, he suggested, was not *ultra vires*, as it only proposed to enact that the proportions of three-fourths London and one-fourth country members should be maintained as nearly as might be. He thought that country members would have great ground for complaint if the bye-laws were silent upon the point, and asked that the opinion of the meeting should be taken.

Upon this being done, the CHAIRMAN declared that the omission of the words was carried, adding that he, on the part of the Council, sincerely hoped that the country members would be fully represented at their board, and that the objection was not to the principle but to the legality of the proposed bye-law.

Bye-law 29, prescribing ten years' practice as a necessary qualification for a member of Council, was withdrawn as *ultra vires*.

On bye-law 30 being reached, a member objected to its being put to the meeting, inasmuch as an amendment to it had been carried at the last meeting, and no fresh notice had been given with regard to it.

The CHAIRMAN said he was of opinion that the principle embodied in the bye-law had been affirmed by the division which had been taken at the commencement of the proceedings.

Some discussion ensued upon this subject; but ultimately it was decided that the bye-law, being declaratory only, and not necessary, should be withdrawn.

Mr. CARPENTER, upon bye-law 32 being read, moved an amendment to the effect that members should not be obliged to sign their own nominations as candidates for election as members of Council. He said there were many persons who, if elected, would willingly fill the office, but they did not like to put themselves forward in antagonism to gentlemen of great respectability who were already on the Council. He was quite aware it had been said that unless some restriction, such as he proposed, were adopted, persons would be nominated who would refuse to serve in any event. He would not object if, after the nominators had sent in a name to the Council proposing a gentleman, the secretary should communicate with him, and ask him whether it was done with his consent. To that the person nominated could write back yes or no, and thus the mischief which was apprehended would be prevented.

The CHAIRMAN said in many cases it had been found that persons had been nominated, and when they were applied to they absolutely refused to serve.

After a short discussion the amendment was lost.

Mr. COVER moved an amendment to the 39th bye-law, as follows:—"The Council shall appropriate a portion of the society's premises for the purposes of refreshment and dining rooms for the use of the members without extra subscription," or "for the purposes of club rooms, for the use of all the members, subject to such annual subscription, not exceeding two guineas, as the committee shall from time to time appoint," and "such rooms shall be managed by a committee composed of four members of the Council, to be selected by the committee, and of four general members of the society, to be chosen at each annual general meeting."

The amendment was lost, some members, otherwise favourable to the proposition, voting against it on the ground that no notice of so important an amendment had been given.

The 50th bye-law, which proposed to require that an auditor should be a practising solicitor of ten years' standing, was struck out, and the bye-laws were then proceed with *seriatim* to the end, and approved, with merely verbal alterations.

Mr. CHAS. HARRISON then moved a bye-law, the effect of which, if carried, would have been to give country members a right of voting by means of voting-papers, under certain conditions, whenever a meeting had been adjourned for the purpose. He said the new charter started with the idea of extending the operations of the society, but out of 11,000 attorneys on the roll only 2,300 belonged to the society, and of these there were only 300 members practising in the country. He thought it was too much to expect gentlemen to come up from Manchester, Birmingham, Newcastle, and other places in order to record their votes personally. He considered that the bye-law which he proposed, if carried, would effect the great object of the society, which was to make itself, in some form or other, the true representative of the whole body of attorneys.

The motion having been seconded,

Mr. WILLIAMS said he thought that the bye-law, if carried, so far from inducing country members to come up and take an interest in the proceedings of the society, would induce them to stay away.

Mr. ROSE considered it would be a most unwise thing to pass such a bye-law as had been proposed.

Mr. LONGBOURNE did not think gentlemen could be expected to come from a very long distance and listen to arguments before they recorded their votes personally, and was in favour of the bye-law.

Mr. COWDELL thought it must be considered that everything which came to the front of the society had been on the minds of the members for some time, and therefore he should support a bye-law which would give country members an opportunity of voting without being present.

Mr. BURTON said nobody was more anxious than he to give effect to the wishes of country members; but when the bye-laws were under the consideration of the Council, it was decided, after much deliberation, that voting by means of voting-papers was impracticable.

Several members having expressed their views upon this subject, Mr. Harrison's resolution was put and lost.

Mr. LAKE then moved a bye-law, having for its object the giving to country solicitors belonging to provincial societies an opportunity of becoming members of the Incorporated Law Society on payment of a reduced subscription. He considered it would have the effect of inducing country members to join provincial societies, which was in itself an advantage, and would, also, as he hoped and believed, induce them to become members of the Incorporated Law Society.

Mr. FINCH seconded the proposition.

A COUNTRY MEMBER, whose name did not transpire, but who stated he was the secretary of a local society, did not believe that country solicitors would join, now that Mr. Carpenter's amendment had been lost, and voting papers

on general questions had been successfully objected to. He did not believe country members required the inducement of a reduction in fees, for which they had ample value in the use of the hall and the society's publications. But he contended that the Council were not sufficiently vigilant in protecting the interests of the profession at large.

Mr. SHIRLEY (Doncaster) spoke highly of what the Council had done, but concurred in the opinion expressed by the last speaker that no reduced fee was necessary.

Several members thanked the mover and seconder for bringing the subject forward, but stated their determination to vote against the proposal, and it was ultimately not pressed.

Upon the motion of the President, seconded by the Vice-President, the bye-laws were unanimously agreed to as being the bye-laws of the society in future.

The proceedings, which had occupied three hours and a half, were brought to a termination by the unanimous approval of a vote of thanks to the Chairman and Council.

ARTICLED CLERKS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held on Wednesday last; Mr. E. F. Stanway in the chair. Mr. Ellis J. Davis opened the subject for the evening's debate, viz.—"That defendants in criminal cases should be competent and compellable to give evidence as in civil cases." The motion was carried by a majority of two.

THE IRISH BAR ON THE JUDICATURE BILL.

[From our own Correspondent.]

DUBLIN, June 12.

An important meeting of the practising members of the Irish bar assembled at the Four Courts Library yesterday afternoon, for the purpose of considering the Judicature Bill for England, at present before Parliament. Thomas McDonnell, Esq., Q.C., occupied the chair. There was a very large attendance of the members of the bar. The Bill in question, while seeking to secure uniformity of decision, and an efficient court of ultimate appeal, by establishing the new Appellate Court, and abolishing the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords, is restricted in its operation to England only, leaving the former jurisdiction of the House of Lords intact so far as respects appeals from the Irish and Scotch Courts. The enormous expense of appealing to the House of Lords in Irish cases, and the great inconvenience and difficulty arising from the necessity of employing new solicitors and new counsel, entire strangers to the case, has been long felt to operate as a denial of justice to the *poor* Irish suitor; and it is thought that, so far as regards Irish appeals, the Bill in question would, if passed into law, deprive the present appellate tribunal of the only merit it is supposed to possess, viz., that of ensuring uniformity of decision in the two countries.

The following resolutions were, after a lengthened discussion, put to the meeting and passed:—1. That to maintain uniformity of decision in the Courts of Law and Equity in England and Ireland, as well as to ensure an efficient tribunal, it is essential that there be the same final court of appeal for Irish and English cases.—Proposed by Mr. Serjeant Armstrong, Q.C., First Serjeant, and seconded by Mr. Hewitt Poole Jellett, Q.C.

2. That as the amount of property involved in many Irish cases does not admit of an appeal to a court sitting in England, it is desirable that the local courts of appeal should be preserved.—Moved by Mr. George May, Q.C., and seconded by Mr. John O'Hagan, Q.C.

3. That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to all members of the Houses of Lords and Commons who are members of the bar.

A number of members of the bar took part in the discussion upon these resolutions, including Messrs. Pilkington, Q.C., William Ryan, Q.C., Gamble, Q.C., Andrews, Q.C., Hugh McDermot, David Ross (elected member of the senate of Queen's University), Edmond Meares Kelly, Gerald FitzGibbon, Q.C., &c., and there was very little difference of opinion as to the object to be desired, viz., a cheap and approachable court of appeal. The proposition of Mr. David Ross that the court of appeal to be established for England should pay periodical visits to Dublin, to dispose of Irish appeals, and thus maintain uniformity of decision in the two countries was received with applause, but was not made the subject of a resolution, Mr. Pilkington, Q.C., explaining that there was nothing in the Bill at present before the House to confine the sittings of the new Appellate Court to London.

After a lengthened debate it was resolved that a committee of the bar should be appointed by the meeting to consider the Bill, and should consist of the following gentlemen:—Messrs. May, Q.C., Pilkington, Q.C., Jellett Q.C., O'Hagan, Q.C., FitzGibbon, Q.C., Gamble, Q.C. Kelly, MacDermot, and David Ross.

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

CALLS TO THE BAR.

The following gentlemen were on Saturday called to the degree of barrister-at-law:—

LINCOLN'S-INN.—William Douglas Edwards (holder of the studentship Trinity Term, 1873), LL.B., University of London; William Henry Rattigan (certificate of honour, first class), M.A., Ph.D. of the University of Rostock; George John Wild, LL.D., Cambridge; Benjamin Fossett Lock, B.A., Cambridge; Charles Archer Cook, B.A., Cambridge; Edward Baron, M.A., Cambridge; George Walter Chapman, B.A., Oxford; Richard Garnett Bellasis, B.A., University of London; Henry Montagu Randall Pope, B.A., Oxford, Fellow of Lincoln College; George Williams Melville Dale, B.A., Cambridge; Thomas Gilbert Carver, B.A., Cambridge; John James Burton, B.A., Cambridge; John James Casie-Chitty, B.A. and S.C.L., Oxford; Francis Chippindale, M.A., Oxford; William Gregory Walker, B.A., Oxford; John Alexander Macmeikan, B.A., Cambridge; Francis Heathcote Wilson, B.A., Oxford; Richard Ward, B.A., Oxford; Alfred Hopkinson, B.A., Oxford; Angelo Coutts, Bainbridge; George Plucknett, M.A., Cambridge; James Francis Hole Bethell, of St. John's College, Cambridge; William Macnaghten Erskine; Francis Gustavius Paulus Neison, F.S.S.; George Edwin Cruickshank, B.A., Cambridge; Ernest Laurence Levett, M.A., Cambridge, Fellow of St. John's College; Edward Albert Wurtzburg, B.A., London; Francis Loraine Petre, University of London; George Morison Macpherson, M.A., Aberdeen (Bombay Civil Service); Robert Fischer, B.L., University of Madras; Emery James Churcher; John George Dillon and James O'Kinealy, B.A., Queen's University in Ireland.

INNER TEMPLE.—Robert Russell Swainston, M.A., Oxford; William Satterley Lord, M.A., Cambridge; William Eugene Outhwaite, B.A., Oxford; Theodore King, B.A., Oxford; Charles Agnew Turner, B.A., S.C.L., Oxford; Israel Davis, M.A., Cambridge; James John Railston, B.A., Cambridge; Richard Jephson Hardman Jones, B.A., Oxford; Francis Reginald Armytage, B.A., Oxford; John Vesey Vesey FitzGerald, B.A., Oxford; Charles James Rowe, B.A., Cambridge; Aretas Wm. Charles Young, B.A., Oxford; Colin Ritchie MacClymont, B.A., Oxford; Frederick Chas. Bradley, M.A., Cambridge; Richard Campbell Davys, Oxford; Nigel Charles Alfred Neville, B.A., Cambridge; Robert Pierpoint, M.A., Oxford; Charles Peter Layard, B.A., Cambridge; George Rogers Jellicoe, London; John Treeve Edgcome, London; Robert Erskine Pollock, LL.B., Cambridge; Matthew Edward Fennessy, London; William Engelbert Lamaison, B.A., Cambridge; Henry Spencer Berkeley; Richard Bramwell Davis, B.A., Cambridge; Joseph Earle Ollivant, M.A., Oxford; Robert John Hinman Parkinson, B.A., Oxford; Frederick Morris Fry, London; Hugh Ker Colville; Rakhal Chandra Roy; Robert Wood Ingram, B.A., Oxford; Francis Booker Fitzroy Cowper; James Winterbottom Hamilton, London; Albert Buckmaster, B.A., Cambridge; Edward Kenrick, Oxford; and Patrick Ryan.

MIDDLE TEMPLE.—James Keith Grosjean (certificate of honour, first class); Richard William Partridge, of Wadham College, Oxford; Richardson Evans, of Wadham College, Oxford, M.A., Queen's University, Ireland; Albert Edward Sykes, of St. John's College, Cambridge; James Crommelin Brown, M.A., of Edinburgh University; George Brooke, of University of London; Joseph James Gormully; William Barrington d'Almeida; John Rowland Lovell Hazeldine; Francis Roxburgh, B.A., Scholar of

Trinity Hall, Cambridge; James Tatlock; Richard Ringwood, B.A., Trinity College, Dublin; John Thomas Hughes; James Coutts, B.A., Sydney University; Reginald Thompson, B.L., of Madras; Edward Arthur Dunn; Krishna Govindá Gupta, of University College, London; Lalmohun Ghose, of University College, London; Cadwallader Waddy; Francis Thomas Dick Barrow; Richard Ambrose Pile Bibby; James Francis Garrick: Anthony Browne Herbert Story; Thomas Conlan, and Henry James Duggan.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

LAST QUOTATION, June 13, 1873.

3 per Cent. Consols, 92¼	Annuities, April, '85 9¼
Ditto for Account, July 2, 92¾	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908
3 per Cent. Reduced 92¾	Ex Bills, £1000, — per Ct. 2 dis.
New 3 per Cent., 92¾	Ditto, £500, Do —2 dis.
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £100 & £200, —2 dis.
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Bank of England Stock, 1¼ per Ct. (last half-year) 246
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73	Ditto for Account,
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

India Stk., 10½ p Ct. Apr. '74, 205	Ind. Enf. Pr., 5 p C., Jan. '72
Ditto for Account. —	Ditto, 5½ per Cent., May, '79 105
Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80 109½	Ditto Debentures, per Cent., April, '64 —
Ditto for Account, —	Do. Do., 5 per Cent., Aug. '73 101
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '88 104½	Do. Bonds, 4 per Ct., £1000
Ditto, ditto, Certificates, —	Ditto, ditto, under £1000
Ditto Enfaced Ppr., 4 per Cent. 96½	

RAILWAY STOCK.

	Railways.	Paid.	Closing Prices.
Stock	Bristol and Exeter	100	114
Stock	Caledonian	100	97½
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western	100	128
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	42
Stock	Great Northern	100	127½
Stock	Do., A Stock*	100	137¼
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	114
Stock	Great Western—Original	100	125½
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	130¼
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	77½
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover	100	22½
Stock	London and North-Western	100	148½
Stock	London and South Western	100	106½
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	78½
Stock	Metropolitan	100	72
Stock	Do., District	100	31½
Stock	Midland	100	139
Stock	North British	100	63¾
Stock	North Eastern	100	163½
Stock	North London	100	120
Stock	North Staffordshire	100	71
Stock	South Devon	100	74
Stock	South-Eastern	100	108

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

Somewhat unexpectedly the Bank rate was reduced on Thursday to 6 per cent. The proportion of reserve to liabilities has increased from 31½ per cent. to above 36 per cent. In the early part of the week there was an advance in railway stocks, owing to the large increase of traffic appearing upon the returns. Prices were somewhat lower on Thursday. There has been no important change in the prices of foreign stocks, but Austrian securities have been lower.

The prospectus has been issued of the City of Ottawa Six per Cent. Sterling Loan, specially secured on the water rates of the city, and further on the general rates levyable on the whole of the assessable property of the city. The issue is of £102,720 sterling loans, in bonds to bearer of £100, £200, and £500 each, and one bond of £220, redeemable at par in gold, in London, on the 1st of May, 1903, unless previously redeemed by drawings at the end of ten, fifteen, twenty, or twenty-five years. The interest is to be payable in gold in London, at the banking house of Messrs. Grant, Brothers & Co., half-yearly, on 1st May and 1st November in each year, by coupons annexed, and the issue price is £102 per cent., including coupon for interest accruing from 1st May last, making, reckoning such accrued interest and discount for prepayment, the net price about par, or £100 per cent. The prospectus states that the total amount of the debenture debt of the Corporation at 15th March, 1872, did not exceed £75,000, which has since been considerably reduced, while the revenue of the corporation for the fiscal year ending 31st December, 1871, as certified by the city auditors, amounted 154,751 dollars, and the value of the property in the City of Ottawa liable to be rated was, according to the assessment made last year, about 7,000,000 dols., or about £1,400,000 sterling.

COURT PAPERS.

30th May, 1873.

I, Roundell Baron Selborne of Selborne, in the county of Southampton, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, entrusted, by virtue of Her Majesty the Queen's Sign Manual, with the care and commitment of the custody of the persons and estates of persons found idiot, lunatic, or of unsound mind, do, with the advice and assistance of the Right Honourable Sir William Milbourne James and the Right Honourable Sir George Mellish, the Lords Justices of the Court of Appeal in Chancery, also being entrusted as aforesaid, hereby in pursuance and exercise of the powers and authorities enabling me in that behalf, order and direct as follows:—

So far as regards costs incurred on and subsequently to the date of this order, the scale of taxation of costs hereby authorized shall be applied to proceedings in lunacy.

Solicitors shall in all matters in which the income of a person who is alleged or is found to be a lunatic or person of unsound mind exceeds £150 per annum, be entitled to charge and be allowed the fees set forth in the column headed "Higher Scale" in the second schedule to the Regulations of the Court of Chancery as to Fees and Charges to be allowed to Solicitors, dated the 30th day of January, 1857, so far as the same shall be applicable to such matters, unless the Lord Chancellor, or the Lords Justices of the Court of Appeal in Chancery, or any or either of them shall make order to the contrary as to all or any of the parties to such matters.

The Masters in Lunacy, or either of them, shall be at liberty, by memorandum to be signed by them or either of them, to allow to a solicitor for attending on any warrant or other appointment before them or either of them such a sum, not exceeding five guineas, as, having regard to the special nature of the case, they or either of them may in their or his discretion think reasonable.

When the Master in Lunacy shall not have made and shall not have refused to make any such allowance as last above mentioned, the Taxing Master shall take into consideration the circumstances of each case, and allow to a solicitor for attending any warrant or other appointment such a sum, not exceeding three guineas, as he may at his discretion think reasonable.

Solicitors shall also be entitled to charge and be allowed the fees set forth in the third schedule to the said Regulations of the Court of Chancery.

SELBORNE, C.
W. M. JAMES, L.J.
GEORGE MELLISH, L.J.

QUEEN'S BENCH.

This Court will, on the 14th, 16th, 17th, and 18th inst., hold sittings, and will proceed in disposing of the cases in the New Trial, Special, and Crown Papers, and any other matters then pending; and will also hold a sitting on the 5th day of July next, for the purpose of giving judgments only.

COMMON PLEAS.

This court will sit on the 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st, and 23rd instant, hold sittings in banco, and proceed in the first instance with the New Trial Paper, commencing with the country new trials, and afterwards proceed with cases in the Special Paper; and will also hold a sitting on the 7th day of July, for the purpose of giving judgments.

THE LATE SIGNOR RATAZZI.—Signor Urbano Ratazzi, the Italian statesman, whose death occurred last week, the *Times* says was educated for the legal profession, and attained a high rank at the bar at Turin. He was afterwards in the Court of Appeal, which had been recently established at Casale, where he gained a high reputation, says M. Vapereau, for legal knowledge, and also for eloquence.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTH.

FRANCIS-WILLIAMS—On June 11, at Cornwall-road, Westbourne-park, the wife of B. Francis-Williams, barrister-at-law, of a son.

MARRIAGES.

BARR—FENTON—On June 5, at St. Paul's Church, Sandgate, Kent, David Barr, solicitor, Glasgow, to Annie, eldest daughter of the late Henry Fenton, Esq., of Sheffield.

FIELD—SHARP—On June 4, at St. James's Church, Piccadilly, Chas. V. Field, Esq., of Saint James's-place and Furnival's-inn, to (Julia) Elizabeth Hood, second daughter of Dr. Sharp, of Talbot-square, Hyde-park.

HULL—WOOD—On June 10, at Monks Kirby, Herbert Edward Hull, Esq., B.A., barrister-at-law, to Sarah, niece of Edward Wood, Esq., of Newbold Revel, Warwickshire.

STEAVENSON—BENNETT—On June 3, at St. George's, Douglas, Isle of Man, D. F. Steavenson, Esq., of the Inner Temple and Newcastle-on-Tyne, barrister-at-law, to Eleanor Matilda, third daughter of J. G. Bennett, Esq., J.P., of Willaston, Isle of Man.

WARWICK—PARKHOUSE—On June 5, at St. Mary's Church, Rickmansworth, Richard Warwick, of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, to Charlotte Jane, eldest daughter of John Parkhouse, of Frogmore, Rickmansworth.

WILLIS—CRAWFORD—On June 11, at St. Peter's, Onslow-gardens, J. Armine Willis, Esq., barrister-at-law, to Janet, daughter of Jas. Coutts Crawford, Esq.

DEATHS.

BROWNE—On June 7, Julia, the wife of Frederick Browne, of 22, Gloucester-crescent, Regent's-park, and No. 19, Margaret-street, Cavendish-square, solicitor, aged 50.

CREW—On June 10, at Salisbury, Thomas Francis Crew, solicitor, formerly of Chelsea and Staple-inn, Holborn, aged 67.

HELPS—On June 5, at Marseilles, Mr. Thomas Helps, of Upton Lawn and The Friars, Chester, solicitor, aged 52.

JOHNS—On June 9, at The Priory, Christchurch, Hants, Henry Tremenheere Johns, Esq., solicitor, Ringwood, aged 55.

NEWSAM—On June 5, at Warwick, Philip William Newsam, solicitor, aged 60 years.

YEWDALL—On June 5, at Avenue House, St. Mark's, Leeds, George Yewdall, solicitor.

ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

AT THE MART.

June 5.—By Mr. J. BEAL.

Camden-hill.—The residential estate, known as Aubery House, and 2a. 1r. 0p. freehold—sold for £17,500.

By Messrs DANIEL SMITH, SON & OAKLEY.

Herts, near Bishop Stortford.—The freehold residential estate, known as Albury Hall, containing 677a. 1r. 6p.—sold for £40,000.

The manor of Albury Hall, with its rights, &c.—sold for £1,250.

Lincolnshire.—A rent charge of £500 per annum, amply secured—sold for £11,150.

By Mr. H. E. MARSH.

Stoke Newington.—Nos. 3 and 4, Stoke Newington-common, freehold—sold for £1,720.

Wimbledon.—Nos. 1 to 5, Linden-cottages, and a plot of land, freehold—sold for, £1,460.

By Messrs. BEADEL.

Huntingdonshire and Cambridgeshire, near Fenstanton—Church Farm, containing 268a. 0r. 33p., freehold—sold for £21,000.

Manor Farm, containing 178a. 1r. 18p.—sold for £10,100.

St. Ives, near.—Enclosures of land, containing 63a. 2r. 39p.—sold for £5,390.

Fenstanton.—Red Hill Farm, containing 558a. 0r. 31p—sold for £29,000.

The manors of Fenstanton and Hilton, with their rights, &c.—sold for £3,200.

Tithe rent charge, commuted at £255 15s. per annum—sold for £4,100.

Kent, near Selling Station.—The Oversland Farm, of 45a. 2r. 37p. freehold—sold for £5,400

June 6.—By Messrs NEWSOM and STANLEY.

Suffolk, Mildenhall.—The Grange Farm, containing 301a. 3r. 35p.—sold for—£13,500.

The Manor Farm, containing 259a. 3r. 31p.—sold for £5,060

The Warren Farm, containing 200a. 1r. 29p.—sold for £3,000.

By Messrs. RUSHWORTH, ABBOTT, and Co,

Sussex, near Sandhurst —Northlands Farm, containing 259a. 3r. 17p., freehold—sold for £7,050.

By Messrs. DEBENHAM, TEWSON and FARMER.

Borough.—Nos. 114, 115, and 116, Great Dover-street, term 18 years—sold for £500.

Bermondsey.—Nos. 162 and 163, Long-lane; and Nos. 1 and 2 and 56, Baalzephon-street, freehold—sold for £1,560.

No. 161, Long-lane, and Nos. 48 and 55, Baalzephon-street—sold for £2,010.

Nos. 41 to 47, Baalzephon-street—sold for £3,900.

Nos. 30 to 40, same street—sold for £3,480.

Nos. 1 to 6, Willesborough-place, freehold—sold for £760.

A range of freehold buildings in Baalzephon-street—sold for £1,440.

Nos. 5 to 24. Baalzephon-street—sold for £5,170.

Nos. 46 to 51, Elim-street, and Nos. 1 and 2, Hallam-place—sold for £710.

Nos. 39 to 45, Elim-street, and Nos. 1 to 10, Ebenezer-row—sold for £1,060.

Nos. 16 to 24, Wilderness-street—sold for £530.

Nos. 3 and 4, Baalzephon-street, and Nos. 1 to 3, Elim-street—sold for £570.

Nos. 4 to 13 Elim-street—sold for £640.

Nos. 14 to 38, Elim-street, and Nos. 5 and 6, Wild's-rents—sold for £2,300

Nos. 1 to 15, Wilderness-street—sold for £1,360.

June 10.—By Messrs. DEBENHAM, TEWSON and FARMER.

Upper Thames-street.—The Commercial Wharf, area, 6,000ft., term 73 years—sold for £18,400.

Kent, near Hildenborough.—Coldharbour-park, and 95a. 1r. 12p., freehold—sold for £6,600.

Surrey, near Godstone.—Maynard's Farm, containing 55a. 3r. 4p.—sold for £2,290.

Hants, near Romsey.—Braishfield House, and 167a. 0r. 33p.—sold for £8,150.

AT THE ROYAL HOTEL, VENTNOR.

May 23.—By Messrs. DRIVER.

Isle of Wight, Bonchurch.—Residence known as "St. Boniface," and 2a. 1r. 0p. freehold—sold for £4,300.

A plot of land, containing 1a. 3r. 0p.—sold for £1,500.

Three plots of land, containing 4a. 0r. 9p.—sold for £1,390.

Ventnor.—Two plots of land—sold for £410.

Bonchurch.—Residence known as "Rose Mount," term 67 years—sold for £2,000.

AT THE KING'S HEAD, CIRENCESTER.

May 27.—By Messrs. ACOCKS & HANKS.

Gloucestershire, Eastington.—Freehold farm, containing 496a. 1r. 29p.—sold for £17,000.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, June 6, 1873.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Teignmouth and General Mutual Alliance Assurance Association.—The Master of the Rolls has fixed Monday, June 16 at 12, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official liquidator.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Briton Ferry Collieries Company (Limited).—By an order made by Vice Chancellor Malins, dated May 28, it was ordered that the above company be wound up. Merriman and Powell, Queen st, Cheapside, solicitors for the petitioners.

Evans's, Covent Garden (Limited).—The Master of the Rolls has, by an order dated May 1, appointed James Cooper, 3, Coleman st buildings, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before July 4, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above. Friday, July 18 at 11, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Liverpool Civil Service and Public Supply Association (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented June 4, directed to be heard before Vice Chancellor Malins, on June 21. Flax and Leadbitter, Leadenhall st, solicitors for the petitioners.

Mines Investment Association of Turkey (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented June 3, directed to be heard before Vice Chancellor Malins, on June 21. Walters and Gush, Finsbury circus, solicitors for the petitioner.

North of Europe Wood Pulp Company (Limited).—By an order made by Vice Chancellor Malins, dated May 26, it was ordered that the above Company be wound up by the Court. Merriman and Powell, Queen st, Cheapside, solicitors for the petitioners.

Phosphate Manure Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented June 3, directed to be heard before Vice Chancellor Malins, on June 21. Snell, George st, Mansion House, solicitor for the petitioners.

TUESDAY, June 10, 1873.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Liverpool Civil Service and Public Supply Association (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented June 6, directed to be heard before Vice Chancellor Bacon, on June 21. Montagu, Bucklersbury, solicitor for the petitioners.

Mines Investment Association of Turkey (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented June 4, directed to be heard before Vice Chancellor Wickens, on Saturday, June 21. Allen and Edwards, Old Jewry, solicitors for the petitioner.

New Sombrero Phosphate Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented June 6, directed to be heard before Vice Chancellor Malins, on June 21. Lindo, King's Arms yard, solicitors for the petitioners.

STANNARIES OF DEVON.

FRIDAY, June 6, 1873.

East Bottle Hill Mining Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented May 30, directed to be heard before the Vice Warden, at 3, Onslow square, Brompton, on Monday, June 16 at 11. Hodge and Co, Truro; Agents for Flower and Nussey, Great Winchester st buildings, petitioners' solicitors.

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

FRIDAY, June 6, 1873.

Liverpool Civil Service and Public Supply Association (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented May 30, directed to be heard before the Vice Chancellor, at 6, Stone buildings, Lincoln's inn, on Tuesday, June 24. Barrell and Rodway, Liverpool, solicitors for the petitioner.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

TUESDAY, June 10, 1873.

Norton Female Benefit Society, Norton, Stockton, Salop. June 4

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, June 6, 1873.

Andrew, William, Brighton, Sussex, Beer Retailer. June 30. Andrew v Andrew, V.C. Bacon. Bilton, Coleman st

Bryan, Edward Langdon, Kensington Park gardens, Doctor. June 30. Palmer v Bryan, V.C. Malins. Clarke and Howlett, Brighton

Haggis, William, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, Innkeeper. June 13. Haggis v Osman, V.C. Bacon. Davies, Old Jewry

McViccar, Duncan, Liverpool, Cotton Broker. July 8. Haywood v Megraw, V.C. Wickens. Bearcroft, Droitwich

Nickols, William, Rothwell, near Leeds, Maltster. June 30. Exley v Ashworth, V.C. Malins. Turner, Rothwell

Phipps, Mary Ann, Clapham rd, Widow. June 30. Meadway v Scrutton, V.C. Malins. Avis, Lincoln's inn fields

Rickards, John James, Aldgate, Housekeeper. July 2. Rickards v Rickards, M.R. Neal, Pinner's hall, Old Broad st

Taylor, John, St George's place, Hyde Park, Esq. July 1. Taylor v Taylor, M.R. Adams, Lincoln's inn fields

NEXT OF KIN.

Bingham, Hon Richard Camden, Marylebone rd. July 5. Bingham v Lucan, M.R

Mobbs, John, Naval Yard, Woolwich, Clerk. June 30. V.C. Malins

TUESDAY, June 10, 1873.

NEXT OF KIN.

Pick, William, Great Ouseburn, Yorkshire, Gent. July 5. Pick v Pick, M.R.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, June 6, 1873.

Archer, Henry, Walter Belchamp, Essex, Farmer. June 24. Andrews and Canham, Sudbury

Atkinson, John, Holme, Westmoreland, Gent. July 10. Thomson and Graham, Kendal

Blair, John, Wrawby, Lincolnshire, Furnace Manager. July 1. Tyson, Maryport

Cook, Joseph, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Staffordshire, Yeoman. June 28. Slaney, Newcastle

Deason, Edward, Ulverston, Lancashire, Coach Builder. Aug 1. Remington, Ulverston

Dewsbury, James, Birmingham, Licensed Victualler. July 3. Coleman and Coleman, Birmingham

Force, Charles Townsend, Exeter. June 24. Force and Force, St. Sidwell st, Exeter

Foulkes, Sarah, Wrexham, Denbigh, Spinster. Aug 1. Salter, Ellesmere

Hall, Caleb Young, Ramsgate, Kent, Licensed Victualler. Sept 30. Daniel, Ramsgate

Hambleton, Thomas, Stoke-upon-Trent, Staffordshire, Farmer. July 7. Redfern and Son, Leek

Harman, James, Bath, Hardwareman. Aug 1. Moger, Bath

Hewitt, Sophia Maria, Bath, Widow. Aug 1. Gibbs, Jun., Bath

Limbery, Josiah, Elmdon, Warwickshire, Gent. July 3. Coleman and Coleman, Birmingham

Mackay, Robert, Liverpool, Draper. July 15. Tyrer and Co, Liverpool

Millar, James Boswell, Belmont rd, Twickenham, Gent. July 18. Grant, Lincoln's inn fields

Money, Maria, Wood st, Upper Clapton, Widow. Sept 3. Goren, South Molton st

Mures, William Lawson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Gent. Aug 12. Hodge and Harle, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Parks, Charles, Over, Chester, Farmer. July 18. Cheshire, Northwich.

Proby, Elizabeth Susan, Twickenham, Middlesex, Spinster. July 15. Gosling, Spring gardens

Rickaby, Thomas, Gisborough, York, Farmer. June 24. Rawling, Gisborough

Riley, James, Witton, Chester, Cabinet Maker. July 18. Cheshire.

Scott, Robert, High st, Southwark, Licensed Victualler. June 16. Butcher, Cheapside

Shore, Richard Gwinnutt, Dudley, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. June 18. Lowe, Dudley.

Stewart, John, Queen Anne st, Cavendish sq, Esq. July 5. Harrison & Co, Bedford row

Stokoe, Ann, Ryton, Durham, Spinster. July 1. Hopper, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Thompson, John, Liverpool, Draper. July 15. Tyrer and Co, Liverpool

Tinker, Jane, Devizes, Wilts, Widow. Aug 1. Stead and Co, Romsey

Turner, Henry, Colchester, Essex, Watch Maker. July 30. Smythies and Co, Colchester

Walker, Immanuel, Ubley, Somersetshire, Yeoman. June 17. Perham

Wiggett, Rev James Samuel, Binfield, Berks. Aug 1. Birchan and Co, Parliament st, Westminster

Wyatt, William, Kennington Park rd, Gent. July 5. Smith and Wall, New inn

TUESDAY, June 10, 1873.

Ager, George, Northumberland st, Strand, Lodging house Keeper. July 14. Hicks and Arnold, Salisbury st, Strand

Barnes, Edward, Stockton, Durham, Gent. July 4. Faber, Stockton

Bergne, Henry, Woollard, Somerset, Tanner. July 1. Perham, Wrington, near Bristol

Francis, Mary, Derby, Widow. July 1. Potter, Derby

Giraud, Rev Edward Augustus, Stanningfield, Suffolk. July 7. Giraud, Furnival's inn

Hardy, Mary, Sacriston, Durham, Innkeeper. July 24. Proctor, jun, Durham

Henshaw, Elizabeth, Over Alderley, Cheshire, Spinster. July 11. Brocklehurst and Co, Macclesfield

Hodgson, Thomas, Brighton, Doctor. Aug 5. Evershed and Shapland, Brighton

Holroyd, Daniel, Smithy Home, Yorkshire, Yeoman. Oct 6. Bottomley, Huddersfield

Holroyd, Elizabeth, Marsden, Yorkshire, Widow. Oct 6. Bottomley, Huddersfield

Isard, Thomas, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, Gent. July 1. Parker and Son, Lewisham

Lewes, Rev Thomas, Taynton. Oct 1. Pelce and Son, Burford

Puddick, Mary Ann, Lower Thames st, Coffee house Keeper. Aug 1. Robinson and Co, Charter house square

Russell, Henry Steward Oldnall, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Esq. July 1. Wight and Co, Dudley

Sedgwick, Rev John, Crook, Westmorland. July 10. Bolton, Kendal

Stubbins, Charles, Ollerton, Notts, out of business. July 17. Handley and Walkden, Mansfield

Taylor, John Edward, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Esq. July 20. Farrar and Co, Lincoln's inn fields

Waldegrave, Right Hon Sarah Countess, Widow. Sept 5. Hunt and Co, Lewes

Wild, Henry James, Canning rd, Croydon, Esq. Sept 9. Radcliffe and Co, Craven st, Charing Cross

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, June 6, 1873.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Anstey, Christopher John, Guildford st, Russell square, Barrister-at-Law. Pet April 8. Spring-Rice. June 18 at 11

Barrilon, George, Leicester square. Pet June 4. Roche. June 19 at 12

Everett, Edgar, York rd, King's Cross, Tavern Keeper. Pet June 3. Hazlitt. June 18 at 1

Hibberd, James, Britannia terrace, Kensal rd, Westbourne Park, Builder. Pet June 3. Hazlitt. June 18 at 12.30

Innes, William, Abingdon st, Civil Engineer. Pet June 4. Hazlitt. June 18 at 2

Marks, Abraham, and Henry Marks, Houndsditch, Wholesale Clothiers. Pet June 4. Roche. June 19 at 12.30

Odger, George, High st, Bloomsbury, Bootmaker. Pet June 3. Brougham. June 20 at 11

Verkruzen, Moritz Anton, Ampton place, Gray's inn rd, Wine Merchant. Pet June 2. Brougham. June 18 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Abrahams, Abraham, Bath, Somersetshire, Boot Warehouseman. Pet June 3. Smith. Bath, June 20 at 11

Dale, Lawrence, Kidsgrove, Staffordshire, Licensed Victualler. Pet June 3. Challinor. Hanley, June 18 at 11

TUESDAY, June 10, 1873.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Franklin, Simon Hyam, Steward st, Spitalfields, Boot Manufacturer. Pet June 7. Murray. June 26 at 11

Harris, William, Wynne road, Brixton road, Grocer. Pet June 6. Murray. June 20 at 11.30

Pyne, Peter, Saint Swithin's lane, Merchant. Pet June 5. Pepys. June 24 at 11

Salmon, William Frederick, Aldermanbury, Tie Manufacturer. Pet June 7. Murray. June 25 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Burnicle, Joseph, Middlesborough, Yorkshire, Joiner. Pet June 6. Crosby. Stockton on-Tees, June 27 at 11.30

Gosling, Richard, Askham-in-Furness, Lancashire, Tailor. Pet June 6. Postlethwaite. Ulverston, June 24 at 2

Granville, Augustus Kerr Bozzi, Plymouth, Devon, Clerk in Holy Orders. Pet June 5. Shelly. East Stonehouse, June 25 at 11

Jackson, James, Eccleshill, Yorkshire, Joiner. Pet June 6. Daniel. Bradford, June 24 at 9

Jones, Thomas, Llanfairfechan, Carnarvon, Brewer's Traveller. Pet June 7. Jones. Bangor, June 25 at 11

Mee, John George, Scoke Albany, Northamptonshire, Baker. Pet June 5. Ingram. Leicester, June 21 at 12

Peake, John, Launceston, Cornwall, Tailor. Pet June 6. Shelley. East Stonehouse, June 24 at 11

Robinson, Joseph, Kingston-upon-Hull, Grocer. Pet June 7. Phillips. Kingston-upon-Hull, June 23 at 11

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

TUESDAY, June 10, 1873.

Parkinson, Elizabeth, Brighton, Sussex, Dealer in Fancy Goods. June 6

Liquidation by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, June 6, 1873.

Baker, George, Highworth, Wilts, Baker. June 17 at 1 at offices of Kinnier and Tombs, High st, Swindon

Bennett, Samuel, Manchester, Brass Founder. June 26 at 3 at offices of Murray, King st, Manchester

Blinko, Moses, Chepping Wycombe, Bucks, Grocer. June 25 at 3 at offices of Parker and Son, Easton st, Chepping Wycombe

Borton, Francis Carr, Hanley, Stafford, Linen Draper. June 12 at 11 at the County Court Offices, Cheapside, Hanley. Stevenson, Hanley

Bowden, John, Thoresthorpe, Lincoln, Clerk in Holy Orders. June 23 at 11 at offices of Brackenbury, Alford

Copp, Samuel, and George Chambers, Edgware rd, Boot Makers. June 13 at 2 at offices of Webster, Basinghall st
Dutton, Peter, Wigan, Lancashire, Grocer. June 30 at 11 at offices of Lees, King st, Wigan
Faithfull, Henry, Brighton, Sussex, Law Clerk, June 24 at 3 at offices of Lamb, Ship st, Brighton
Fewster, Robert, Kingston-upon-Hull, Joiner. June 19 at 1 at office of Mends, Land of Green Ginger, Kingston-upon-Hull
Gilbert, Edward, Old Jewry, Stationer. June 23 at 2 at offices of Linklater and Co, Walbrook
Gore, William Henry, York place, Baker st, Portman square, Gent. June 16 at 3 at the Guildhall Coffee house, Gresham st. Edmands and Mayhew, Poultry
Guerra, Guiseppe, Falmouth, Cornwall, Merchant's Clerk. June 21 at 2 at offices of Tilly and Co, Falmouth
Hall, Joseph, Blackburn, Lancashire, Cotton Manufacturer. June 27 at 3 at offices of Boote and Edgar, George st, Manchester
Hart, Henry Aaron, Houndsditch, Hardwareman. June 18 at 2 at the Guildhall Coffee House. Payne and Nelson, King's rd, Bedford row
Hartley, James, Wardle, Rochdale, Lancashire, Woollen Manufacturer. June 20 at 3 at the Wheat Sheaf Hotel, Fennel st, Manchester. Standring, Rochdale
Holdsworth, Henry, Normanby, Yorkshire, Grocer. June 19 at 10 at offices of Fawcett and Co, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees
Howe, Henry, Wynford rd, Barnsbury, Fret Cutter. June 18 at 12 at 33, Gutter lane. Flunkett, Gutter lane
Jessop, Mary, Uppermill, Yorkshire, Grocer. June 18 at 3 at the Mitre Hotel, Cathedral yard, Manchester. Blackburn, Oldham
Jones, William, Bristol, Builder. June 14 at 11 at offices of Essery, Guildhall, Broad street, Bristol
Kelson, George, Princes End, Staffordshire, Stationer. June 17 at 3 at offices of Stokes, Priory st, Dudley
King, John Thomas, Highbury crescent, Highbury, Stationers. June 23 at 2 at offices of Linklater and Co, Walbrook
Leafong, William, Strand, Perfumer. June 20 at 3 at offices of Makinson and Carpenter, Elm court, Temple
Martin, Robert, and John Viney, Leadenhall st, Ship Brokers. June 19 at 12 at offices of Quitter and Co, Moorgate st. Parker and Clarke, St Michael's alley, Cornhill
Martin, Stephen, Manor place, Amherst rd, Hackney, Builder. June 18 at 2 at offices of Thwaites, Basinghall st. Fulcher, Basinghall st
Moore, John, Popham rd, Essex rd, Islington, Cheesemonger. June 24 at 12 at offices of Poncione, jun, Raymond buildings, Gray's inn
Newborough, John, Sneinton, Notts, Shoemaker. June 23 at 3 at office of Cranch and Rowe, Low pavement, Nottingham
Oberdoerffer, Mathews Adolphe, Regent st, Quadrant, Tobacconist. June 23 at 12 at offices of Gibbon, Great James st, Bedford row
Owens, Robert, Brookhouse Mill, Denbigh, Miller. June 23 at 3 at the Kinmel Arms Hotel, St Asaph. Roberts, St Asaph
Parry, John, Liverpool, Butcher. June 23 at 2 at offices of Meadows, Dale st, Liverpool
Pilley, Samuel Grimshaw, Calverley, Yorkshire, Cloth Manufacturer. June 20 at 2 at offices of Carr, Albion st, Leeds
Price, John Cooke, Sidney place, Stamford hill, Surgeon. June 20 at 4 at office of Webb and Pearson, Austin friars
Purves, George, Waterloo, near Liverpool, Butcher. June 19 at 2 at offices of Etty, Lord st, Liverpool
Riley, John, Hapton, Lancashire, Labourer. June 21 at 11 at offices of Hartley, Nicholas st, Burnley
Samson, Thomas, Portland, Dorsetshire, Hotel Keeper. June 23 at 12 at the Auction Mart, Market st, Melcombe Regis. Howard, Melcombe Regis
Scrivener, Walter Trigg, Finningham, Suffolk, Grocer. June 23 at 11 at offices of Watts, Butter Market, Ipswich
Setford, William, Nile st, East rd, Hoxton, Grocer. June 20 at 1 at offices of Ashwin, Garden court, Temple
Spence, Lewis Henry, and Christian Henry Fisher, Hatton Garden, Merchants. July 1 at 3 at office of Lawrance and Co, Old Jewry chambers
Stennett, John, Langrick Ville, Lincolnshire, out of business. June 18 at 2 at offices of Dyer, Boston
Terry, Rose, Brompton rd, Milliner. June 18 at 2 at office of Dalton and Jessett, St Clement's House, Clement's lane, Lombard st
Thomas, Jeffrey, Llandudno, Carnarvon, Hotel Keeper. June 23 at 12 at the Ermine Hotel, Chester. Jones, Conway
Usher, John Wilkins, Leeds, Confectioner. June 20 at 3 at offices of North and Sons, East Parade, Leeds
Webbe, William, Ivy lane, Bookseller. June 14 at 2 at offices of Warrand, Ludgate hill
Weight, Robert, Stroud, Gloucestershire, Grocer. June 20 at 11 at the Subscription Rooms, Stroud. Smith, Stroud
Whitehead, John, David Whitehead, and Henry Whitehead, Leicester, Elastic Web Manufacturers. June 17 at 3 at the Bell Hotel, Leicester. Wright, High Holborn
Williams, David Walter, Aberystwith, Cardigan. June 18 at 11 at 1, Baker st, Aberystwith. Atwood
Wilson, Joseph, Eckington, Derby, Grocer, June 20 at 11 at offices of Cutts, New square, Chesterfield
Yrigoyti, Francis de, Leicester square, Wine Merchant. June 30 at 2.30 at offices of Lewis, Albany court yard

ESTATES and HOUSES to be SOLD or LET.—Messrs. Venton, Bull, & Cooper's Monthly Register, containing full particulars of Estates and Farms, Furnished and Unfurnished Houses in town and country, Ground Rents and Investments generally, may be had free on application or by post for one stamp. Owners having properties for disposal are invited to send full particulars to the Auction and Estate Agency Offices, 8, Bucklersbury, E.C.

Periodical Sales.

MR. MARSH begs to announce that his PERIODICAL SALES (established in 1843) for the Disposal of Reversions, Absolute and Contingent, Life Interests and Annuities, Policies of Life Assurance, Shares in all public undertakings, Advowsons and next presentations, manorial rights, and tithe rent charges, are APPOINTED to TAKE PLACE on the first Thursday in each month throughout the present year, as under:—

June 5th.	July 7th.	Sept. 4th.	Nov. 6th,
	Aug. 3rd.	Oct. 2d.	Dec. 4th.

Also that the following days are appropriated during the present year for the sale of Freehold Estates, town or country Mansions, Copyhold and Leasehold Properties, suburban and town Residences, Freehold and Leasehold Ground-rents, and every description of real property:—

May 15th, 22nd, and 29th.	September 18th and 25th.
June 19th, 19th, and 26th.	October 16th and 23rd.
July 10th, 17th, 24th, and 31st.	November 20th and 27th.
August 14th, and 21st.	December 11th and 18th.

Auction, land and estate agency offices, 54, Cannon-street, E.C.

Important Freehold Investment, No. 16, George-street, Hanover-square, the residence of Sir Wm. Fergusson, Bart., F.R.S., &c.

MESSRS. WOOD, LANGRIDGE & CO. will SELL by AUCTION, at the MART, on THURSDAY, the 19th JUNE, 1873, at ONE precisely (by direction of the owner), the above capital FREEHOLD MANSION, of handsome elevation, and substantially built. It contains nine good bed-rooms on two floors, three drawing-rooms, dining-room, morning-room, library, good entrance hall, principal and back stairs, and commodious servants' offices. In good substantial and decorative repair. Is let on a repairing lease, expiring Midsummer, 1879, at the nominal rent of £300 per annum; but which, after that period, will be very much increased.

May be viewed by cards only, to be obtained of the auctioneers, and particulars and conditions of sale had at the Mart; of

ALFRED PEACHEY, Esq., solicitor, 17, Salisbury-square;

and at the Auctioneers' offices, 65, New Bond-street.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER'S LIST of ESTATES and HOUSES to be SOLD or LET, including Landed Estates, Town and Country Residences, Hunting and Shooting Quarters, Farms, Ground Rents, Rent Charges, House Property and Investments generally, is published on the first day of each month, and may be obtained, free of charge, at their offices, 80, Cheapside, E.C., or will be sent by post in return for two stamps.—Particulars for insertion should be received not later than four days previous to the end of the preceding month.

Highbury New-park.—Excellent Investments, in superior residences, let to first-class tenants at low rentals, varying from £84 to £94 per annum; also a capital Family House, with possession.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER will SELL, at the MART, on TUESDAY, JUNE 17, at TWO, in lots, the following valuable LEASEHOLD RESIDENCES:—

Lot 1. No 44, Highbury New-park, let to F. Browning, Esq., on lease at per annum	£84	0	0
Lot 2. No. 46, Highbury New-park, let to W. Sturt, Esq., at per annum	93	0	0
Lot 3. No. 48, Highbury New-park, let to Mrs. Venn, at per annum	90	0	0
Lot 4. No. 54, Highbury New-park, let to S. F. Langham, Esq., on lease, at per annum	90	10	0
Lot 5. No. 56, Highbury New park, let to D. Bauman, Esq., on lease, at per annum	94	0	0
Lot 6. No. 186, Highbury New-park, to be sold, with possession on completion of the purchase. Annual value ...	95	0	0
Total rentals	£546	10	0

Held for long terms, at very moderate ground-rents.

Particulars of

W. G. COVENTON, Esq., solicitor, 8, Gray's-inn-square;

and of the Auctioneers, 80, Cheapside.

Ramsgate, Kent.—By order of the Mortgagees.—A commodious Freehold Residence and grounds, suitable for private occupation, and especially adapted for a professional man, being situate in the heart of the town, near the Market-place, offering also to builders and others unusual facilities for development by conversion into shops. For sale with possession. Also, a Freehold Dwelling House adjoining, let at £25 a year.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER will SELL at the MART, on TUESDAY, JUNE 17, at TWO, in two Lots, the following PROPERTIES, viz:—

Lot 1. The capital FREEHOLD FAMILY RESIDENCE, 55, Queen-street, Ramsgate, comprising eight good bed chambers, a dressing room, large square entrance hall, dining room 24ft. by 18ft., drawing room 24ft. by 18ft. 6in., including bay with French casements opening to the grounds, morning room, breakfast room, lofty kitchen, servants' hall, and convenient domestic offices. At the rear of the house is a large garden with lawns and flower beds, fishpond, and rockeries; and well planted with thriving shrubs and trees. For sale with possession.

Lot 2. The FREEHOLD DWELLING-HOUSE (adjoining lot one), No. 12, Effingham-street, Ramsgate, containing seven rooms on the upper floors, two rooms on the ground floor, together with a commodious basement and a yard at the rear, let to Mr. Chapman, yearly tenant, at the low rent of £25.

Particulars of

C. E. FREEMAN, Esq., Solicitor, 20, Gutter-lane, City;

and of the Auctioneers, 80, Cheapside.

Sussex, near Lewes.—The valuable Freehold Estate, comprising Lentbridge and Vicarage Farms, in the parishes of Plumpton and Westmeston, within a few minutes' walk of Plumpton Station, about 2½ miles from Cook's-bridge Station, and only five miles from the capital markets and stations at Lewes and Hayward's-heath. It comprises about 105½ acres of fertile pasture and arable land, well watered, and lying in a ring fence, having considerable road frontage, including two farmhouses and homesteads. Let to Mr. Simmonds at the low old rent of £110 per annum.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER will SELL, at the MART, on TUESDAY, JUNE 17, at TWO, the above described FREEHOLD PROPERTY.

Particulars of,

W. G. COVENTON, Esq., Solicitor, 8, Gray's-inn-square;

and of the Auctioneers, 80, Cheapside.

By order of Mortgagees.—Twickenham, Middlesex, about half a mile from the Station. A capital Copyhold Family Residence, with stabling, outbuildings, and attractive grounds, formerly the residence of the late King Louis Philippe when Duke of Orleans.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER will SELL, at the MART, on TUESDAY, JUNE 17, at TWO, in One Lot, the desirable FAMILY RESIDENCE, known as High Shot-house, on the Richmond-road, Twickenham, containing seven bed chambers, dressing room, dining and drawing rooms, smoking room, store room, convenient offices, and cellarage, five-stall stable, double coach-house, loft, fowl, wood, and tool houses. The grounds include a lawn, well stocked pleasure and kitchen gardens, enclosed by brick walls. Let to an old-standing tenant on a yearly tenancy at £100. The property (excepting a small portion of the garden, which is freehold) is copyhold of the Manor of Isleworth, subject to a nominal fine. It possesses a frontage of upwards of 250ft., and is an eligible building site.

Particulars of

S. HARLEY KOUGH, Esq., Solicitor, Church Stretton; of

Messrs. GRIFFITHS & BROWNLOW, Solicitors, 34 Bedford-row;

and of the Auctioneers, 80, Cheapside.

Chigwell, Essex.—7¾ acres of valuable Freehold Land (Brick Earth), intersected by the river Roding, and approached from the main road between Chigwell and Abridge. It contains a bed of fine golden clay, suitable for the manufacture of best face bricks, the remaining portions of a stronger quality. The above is well situate for the manufacture of bricks, &c., and a ready sale can be commanded at remunerative prices, there being no other brickfield in the neighbourhood; easy cartage to the following places of about four and two miles respectively: Woodford, Buckhurst-hill, Loughton, Chigwell, Theydon Bois, and surrounding places, where buildings are being erected.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER will SELL, at the MART, on TUESDAY, June 17, at TWO, the above described valuable FREEHOLD LAND.

Particulars, with plans, of

Messrs. PEACOCK & GODDARD, Solicitors, 3, South-square, Gray's-inn;

and of the Auctioneers, 80, Cheapside.

Lewisham.—By order of the Mortgagees.—About a mile from New Cross and Lewisham Junction Stations, and only a few minutes' walk from Lewisham-road Station. The capital semi-detached Residence, known as No. 27, Tresillian-road, Lewisham-high-road. It has a garden in front, is brick built with stone dressings, and comprises five bed chambers, three sitting rooms, one of which opens to a conservatory, kitchen, scullery, and suitable offices, together with a good garden in the rear. Let to Miss Selby, yearly tenant, subject to three months' notice, at the low rent of £45 per annum; held for 99 years from 1866, at £7.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER will SELL at the MART, on TUESDAY, JUNE, 17, at TWO, the above described genteel RESIDENCE, suitable as an investment, with the opportunity of obtaining early possession if desired.

Particulars of

C. E. FREEMAN, Esq., Solicitor, 20, Gutter-lane;

and of the Auctioneers, 80, Cheapside.

Borough High-street.—The Tabard or Talbot Inn, the famous old English hostelry at which the Canterbury Pilgrims assembled, in the time of Chaucer, before proceeding on their journey; together with the Talbot Publichouse, and other Buildings in the Inn-yard comprising several warehouses (including a substantial and extensive hop warehouse of six lofty floors, recently erected), workshops, large ranges of stabling, offices, and dwelling houses, with gateway entrance from the main thoroughfare; also two houses and shops, Nos. 85 and 89, Borough High street, the whole being freehold, land tax redeemed, and the present income, exclusive of the portions in hand, about £1,200 per annum. The property occupies the important area of upwards of 29,000 square feet, and being situate within sight of London-bridge, and close to the Hop Market and London, Brighton, and South Eastern Railway Stations, is specially adapted for a goods depot, or for the erection of warehouses and other mercantile premises, which would produce a large annual ground-rent. It is also, perhaps, the finest site in this district now available for a first-class theatre, hall, or public building.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER will SELL at the MART, on THURSDAY, JUNE 19, at TWO, in one lot, the very valuable FREEHOLD PROPERTY above described. The hop warehouse is let on lease for a term having about 20 years to run, the remainder on yearly and other tenancies, which will expire at Michaelmas next, or are determinable on giving six months' notice at any time, so that a purchaser will have the benefit of almost immediate possession.

Particulars, with plans, may be had of

Messrs. HOLLINGSWORTH, TYERMAN & GREEN, Solicitors, 4, East India-avenue, Leadenhall-street,

and of the Auctioneers, 80, Cheapside.